

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БЕОГРАДУ
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

Ирина Н. Ковачевић

**УПОТРЕБА АРХЕТИПСКИХ СТРУКТУРА У
ПРОЗИ ЏЕЈМСА ЏОЈСА**

Докторска дисертација

Београд, 2017.

UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE
FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

Irina N. Kovačević

**THE USE OF ARCHETYPAL STRUCTURES
IN JAMES JOYCE'S FICTION**

Doctoral Dissertation

Belgrade, 2017

УНИВЕРСИТЕТ В БЕЛГРАДЕ
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ФАКУЛЬТЕТ

Ирина Н. Ковачевич

**ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ АРХЕТИПИЧЕСКИХ
СТРУКТУР В ПРОЗЕ ДЖЕЙМСА ДЖОЙСА**

Докторская диссертация

Белград, 2017

Podaci o mentoru i članovima komisije

Mentor: dr Zoran Paunović, redovni profesor, Filološki fakultet – Beograd

Uža naučna oblast: Engleska i američka književnost

Članovi komisije:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Datum odbrane:

Beograd, _____

UPOTREBA ARHETIPSKIH STRUKTURA U PROZI DŽEJMSA DŽOJSA

Rezime

Predmet ove disertacije je istraživanje upotrebe arhetipskih struktura u književnom opusu Džejmsa Džojisa, koje se prvenstveno zasniva na njegovim proznim delima, a to su: *Dablinci* (1914), *Portret umetnika u mladosti* (1916), *Uliks* (1922) i *Fineganovo bdenje* (1939). Osnovni pristup građi izvršen je sa stanovišta jungovske i arhetipske kritike, kao i Jungovog koncepta kolektivno nesvesnog koji se sastoji od arhetipova i simbola. Autori koji koriste ovu kritiku i predloške pronađene u mitološkom korpusu uvrstavaju se po potrebi kako bi podržali relevantne argumente. Ispitujući Džojsova dela na osnovu uzastopne upotrebe (jungovskih) arhetipova može se postići bolje razumevanje samih tekstova. Kao teorijska osnova za upotrebu jungovskih arhetipova u Džojsovoj prozi, razmatraju se i prilagođavaju učenja različitih književnih teorija u meri u kojoj je to relevantno za predmet istraživanja. U određenoj fazi, teorijski aspekt disertacije se blago oslanja na poststrukturalističku kritiku, naročito na teoriju intertekstualnosti i na polje semiotike i semiologije.

Teorijsko-metodološki okvir uspostavlja se pregledom glavnih pitanja arhetipske kritike kako bi se stvorile smernice za primenu jungovskih arhetipova i Jungovog koncepta kolektivno nesvesnog u praktičnoj analizi. Prepoznajući da umetnička dela sadrže arhetipske strukture koje prevazilaze individualno nesvesno, Jung je primenu teorije nesvesnog preneo izvan područja psihologije, što je neminovno izvršilo značajan uticaj na književnu analizu, jer Jung postavlja okvir univerzalnosti prema kome su sva umetnička ostvarenja jedinstvena, ali istovremno sadrže obrasce koje možemo pronaći i u drugim delima.

Arhetip (Jung, 1919) se definiše kao skrivena predstava ukorenjena u kolektivno nesvesnom koje upravlja ljudskom psihom ili predstavlja njen proizvod; arhetipovi, kao nadindividualne strukture, opiru se racionalnoj analizi. Nortrop Fraj (*Anatomija kritike*) takođe zagovara sličan odnos prema arhetipskoj strukturi, gde on uporedno istražuje umetnička dela i književnost kako bi dokazao univerzalnu istovetnost ljudskog uma. Frajev arhetip je povratna slika koja omogućava povezivanje dva književna dela, a zahvaljujući tome i integraciju književnog iskustva.

U disertaciji se uspostavljaju analogije između razprezentativnih delova Džojsovog književnog korpusa, sa ciljem da se između njih utvrdi veza i klasifikacija pronađenih

arhetipskih struktura. Hronološkim redosledom uvode se poglavlja posvećena ispitivanju pojedinačnih dela. Pojedini likovi i motivi pojavljuju se u više dela, te studija teži da uspostavi analogije među arhetipskim strukturama različitih dela, dodatno osvetljavajući Džojsovu istrajnost u prikazivanju univerzalnih motiva koji predstavljaju okvir njegove naracije.

Analiza se zasniva na dve polazne pretpostavke.

1. Upotreba jungovskih arhetipova u Džojsovoj prozi ima funkciju da označi tipične paradigmatičke zaplete, likove, teme i druge elemente književnog teksta koji predstavljaju osnovu za razumevanje i usvajanje narativâ. U tom smislu, u Džojsovoj prozi, *arhetipki* su, *likovi* junaka, varalice, autsajdera, neverne žene; uzorna *iskustva*, poput paralize, detinjstva (nevinost/naivnost, odrastanje), materenistva (velika majka, plodnost, seksualnost), očinstva (autoritet, mudri starac); međusobno povezani *motivi* vode i zemlje, smrti i ponovnog rađanja, putovanja; *coniunctio* i *coincidencia oppositorum* predstavljaju organizacionu strukturu pomoću koje opozicioni arhetipovi funkcionišu u dualitetu i ujedinjuju se u totalitet.

2. Prema Džozefu Kembelu, postoji univerzalna priča o *junakovom putovanju* koja se zasniva na jungovskim arhetipovima i koja je izvorno inspirisana Džojsovim konceptom *monomita*. Džojsovi romani, posebno *Uliks*, mogu se interpretirati u okviru ovog arhetipskog obrasca. Prolazeći kroz Kembelove etape (*odlazak*, *inicijacija* i *povratak*), junak ispisuje pun krug ne bi li došao do otkrovenja i samospoznaje. Sa Jungovog stanovišta, ova arhetipska struktura (*transformacijski proces*) predstavlja osnovu mitova o promenama i narodnih priča, što je podloga za dalje istraživanje razvoja (*individuacije* i *transformacije*) književnog lika.

Nakon uspostavljanja temeljnog književno-kritičkog pregleda i sakupljanja najreprezentativnijih delova Džojsovog književnog korpusa, rezultati analize na osnovu postavljenih hipoteza pokazuju korelaciju između arhetipskih struktura i Džojsovog proznog stvaralaštva kojim se potvrđuje prisustvo osnovnih jungovskih arhetipova, situacionih arhetipova, arhetipskih likova i simbola. Osim toga, usavršavajući upotrebu arhetipskih struktura koje sadrže trajne motive ljudske psihe, a koji se manifestuju i u književnoj formi, Džojsova postavlja i rešava problem individuacije i transformacije ličnosti, što je jedan od osnovnih postupaka koji objedinjuje njegovo stvaralaštvo.

Kao krajnji ishod, ovaj doktorat predstavlja analitički i kritički pregled Džojsove proze kao mnoštvo arhetipskih struktura koje moraju biti raščlanjene kako bi razmatrani književni

korpus bio jasniji. Na taj način, Džojsova proza je bolje shvaćena u okviru jungovske i arhetipske kritike kao vodičâ kroz labirint njegovih dela.

Tekst je podeljen na sedam osnovnih poglavlja.

Prvo i uvodno poglavlje pruža kratak pregled Džojsovih književnih nastojanja, nakon čega se sugerije prisustvo arhetipova u svima njima, što zahteva detaljnu studiju kako bi se dobila što jasnija predstava o njihovoj upotrebi.

Drugo poglavlje predstavlja teorijsko-metodološku osnovu, a započinje konstatacijom da čitanje Džojsova predstavlja oksimoron kako za čitaoca tako i za ozbiljnog proučavaoca. Kao jedno od rešenja za dolično razumevanje Džojsovskih tekstova, predlaže se jungovska i arhetipska kritika čija primena rasvetljava osnovne arhetipske figure, likove, iskustva i motive. Centralni deo poglavlja fokusira se na “prirodu arhetipa”, onako kako ga njegov “tvorac” Jung objašnjava i kao što ga u književnosti prepoznaje Nortrop Fraj. Na jungovsku kritiku nadovezuje se i kritika njegovih studenata, saradnika i istomišljenika poput Jolande Jakobi, Mari-Luiz fon Franc, Edvarda Edingera, Eriha Nojmana i drugih. Potom se predlaže *mythos* kao metodologija koja se predstavlja i suprotstavlja *logos-u* (Armstrong i Kembel). Zaključni deo upućuje da arhetipska kritika može da obezbedi bolji pristup Džojsovoj prozi kao “ključ” za potpunije razumevanje njene suštine.

Treće poglavlje fokusira se na *Dablince* koji su predstavljeni kroz *paralizu*, *gnomon* i *simoniju*, zajedno formirajući trijumvirat koji upravlja osnovnim motivima priča. Kao kroz prizmu, kroz njih isplivava arhetip jungovske senke. Utvrđeno je da je sveobuhvatni motiv ovih priča prikazan kroz arhetip senke kao nemogućnost i najmanje promene. Likovi su sprečeni da postignu bilo kakvu sposobnost inicijacije i transformacije. Iščitava se upečatljivo nedovršena individuacija likova, kao i ostali arhetipovi i njihovi povezani simbolički aspekti (*otac*, *majka*, *crkva*, *Irska*, *izgnanstvo*, *prozor*). Od posebnog interesa za ovo poglavlje su sledeće priče: “Sestre”, “Arabija”, “Evelin”, “Bolan slučaj” i “Mrtvi”, uključujući i delove drugih priča na koje se istraživanje oslanja po potrebi.

Četvrto poglavlje razmatra *Portret umetnika u mladosti* i estetiku koja se odnosi na ovaj roman, kao i zašto je ona važna za upotrebu epifanije. Teorijski koncept epifanije kao “arhetipskog iskustva” (Beja) razumeva se i kao polazna tačka estetike koju mladi umetnik nastoji da razvije (Nun). Analiza prati glavnog lika, Stivena Dedalusa, (kroz etape: delimično odvajanje i individuaciju) i sveobuhvatnu promenu ličnosti koja izranja kroz epifaniju. Junak-

umetnik, Stiven, se sagledava prema ovom teorijskom okviru, kao i sve njegove persone (maske). Najvažnije epifanije su izdvojene i detaljno objašnjene. Pored toga, kompleks oca/majke, inflacija ega, *anima* i *animus* su prikazani kao “ključne tačke” u sukobu pomoću kojih junak dolazi do pomirenja sa svojom senkom. Prikazuje se i greh kao motiv spasenja, što dovodi do zaključka da je maska odbačena u korist prihvatanja *sopstva*. Ipak, ovo izlaže junaka opasnosti od arhetipskog “pada” ukoliko ono što je naučeno ne bude uspeo da primeni.

Interpretacija romana *Uliks* izvršena je u petom poglavlju u okviru arhetipskog obrasca *junakovo putovanje* koji predlaže Kember i oslanja se na koncept *monomita* ukazujući na činjenicu da svi mitovi strukturalno podjednako učestvuju i dele istu formaciju, što ne mora biti slučaj sa svim narativima. Stoga, putovanja Odiseja, Hamleta, Leopolda Bluma i Stivena Dedalusa sadrže istu sveobuhvatnu strukturu. Poglavlje je podeljeno u nekoliko sekcija koje na odgovarajući način korespondiraju sa arhetipskim konceptom junakovog putovanja. “Odlazak” proučava prva dva poglavlja *Uliksa*, “Telemah” i “Nestor”, kao odvajanje junaka od starog sveta što vodi ka otuđenosti i žudnji za celovitošću i povezanošću sa novim svetom. Zatim, inicijacija započinje u poglavlju “Protej”. Konačno, ep “Nostos”, ili povratak kući, najbolje iščitavamo kroz poglavlje “Itaka” kao reintegraciju *sopstva*. Nakon ispitivanja Stivenovog lika, pažnja se preusmerava na proučavanje Leopolda Bluma, njegovog lika kao antipoda Stivenovom. Blumova transformacija započinje u poglavlju “Had”. Analiza se završava ispitivanjem poglavlja “Penelope”, gde se čitaocu predstavlja tumačenje monologa Moli Blum kroz Kristevinu teoriju označavanja (semiotika i simbolika), istovremeno prikazujući harmonizaciju prethodnih dešavanja i transformacije likova kroz njihova uzorna putovanja.

Šesto poglavlje zaokružuje analizu Džojsovog književnog korpusa gde je čitaocu predstavljen koncept upotrebe arhetipskih struktura koje služe kao organizacioni princip *Fineganovog bdenja*. Ciklični mit upotrijebljen je kao osnova za čitanje na koju se i sam Džojso oslanja (Viko). Na nju se nadovezuje i kritički okvir u kojem se roman sagledava kao ponavljajuća struktura koja priča i prepričava slično dešavanje (Elijade) koristeći se uvek istim likovima, čija se imena doduše menjaju, ali su u suštini referentno polje njihovog dvojnog porekla. Osnovni motiv jeste ciklično stvaranje sveta i pad čovečanstva koji su predstavljeni kao opozicioni arhetipovi (*coniunctio*) koji se spajaju da bi formirali *coincidencia oppositorum*. Odgovarajući arhetipski motivi oslanjaju se na uzorne likove. U suštini, roman predstavlja priču koja se sastoji od stalne dekompozicije i rekompozicije.

Zaključno, sedmo poglavlje nudi pregled osnovnih rezultata do kojih se analizom došlo i pruža sintezu Džojsovog stvaralaštva, stila pisanja ali i mogućnosti autobiografskog čitanja iz reprezentativnih dela. Pretpostavlja se, pošto su arhetipovi osnova Džojsove fikcije, da su biografske činjenice poslužile samo kao polazna tačka ugrađivanja, i da nikako ne predstavljaju jedini izvor za narativne postupke. Konačna analiza ukazuje da su upravo arhetipovi ti koji predstavljaju osnov za razumevanje Džojsovih dela kao opšti obrazac u stvaranju njegovog proznog izraza, a nikako mikro-specifičnosti. Stoga, dalje istraživanje ponovo predlaže detaljnije arhetipsko čitanje.

Ključne reči: Džejms Džojls, arhetipska kritika, jungovska kritika, monomit, junakovo putovanje, arhetip, simbol, naracija, ciklični mit, transformacija lika, individuacija

Naučna oblast: Društveno-humanističke nauke

Uža naučna oblast: Filološke nauke

UDK broj:

THE USE OF ARCHETYPAL STRUCTURES IN JAMES JOYCE'S FICTION

Summary

The subject of this dissertation is the exploration of the use of archetypal structures in Joyce's literary oeuvre, primarily based on Joyce's prose works, namely *Dubliners* (1914), *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), *Ulysses* (1922), and *Finnegans Wake* (1939). The main approach to these works is undertaken from the standpoint of Jungian and archetypal criticism, as well as of Jung's concept of the collective unconscious consisting of the base form of archetypes and symbols. Other corresponding authors using this criticism and theories on patterns that can be found in mythology are also incorporated when needed to support relevant arguments. By interpreting Joyce's works on the basis of their repeatedly used (Jungian) archetypes, a clearer understanding of the texts may be better attained. As a theoretical background for defining Jungian archetypes located in Joyce's fiction, the use of various literary theories is also reviewed and adapted to the extent that is relevant to the subject of the research. The theoretical aspect of the dissertation also slightly relies on post-structuralist criticism at one stage, especially the theory of intertextuality, and the field of semiotics and semiology.

The theoretical-methodological framework itself is established by reviewing the main issues of archetypal criticism to create guidelines of Jungian archetypes and Jung's concept of the collective unconscious to be employed in practical analysis. Through the recognition that works of art contain archetypal structures that surpass the individual unconscious, Jung was able to transfer the theory of the unconscious to application beyond the field of psychology. Such archetypal theories have inevitably had a significant impact on literary analysis, since Jung lays a framework of universality by which all works of art may be simultaneously compared as unique yet inherent to all. Archetype (Jung, 1919) is defined as a hidden role rooted in the collective unconscious that governs the human *psyche* or is produced from it. Archetypes, as supra-individual structures, defy rational analysis. Northrop Frye (*Anatomy of Criticism*) also discusses a similar relationship to archetypal structure, in which he comparatively researches works of art and literature as to prove a universal semblance of the human mind. Frye's archetype is the reflective image that allows the interconnection of two literary works, according to which the integration of the literary experience arises.

Analogies through selective excerpts of Joyce's literary corpus are utilized in this dissertation in order to determine the relationship between them and their classification of found archetypal structures. A chapter dedicated to each work is reviewed chronologically. Certain characters and motifs appear in more than one work; hence, the study seeks to establish an interrelationship between the archetypal structures of various works, thus additionally illuminating Joyce's persistence in presenting universal motifs that form the framework of his narrative style.

The analysis itself is based on two initial hypotheses:

1. The use of Jungian archetypes in Joyce's work bears the function of marking typical paradigmatic plots, characters, themes, motifs, and other elements of literary texts, which structure the core understanding of narratives and comprehending them. Therefore, archetypal structures that occur in Joyce's fiction include: *archetypal characters* of the hero, trickster, outsider, unfaithful wife; exemplary *experiences*, such as paralysis, childhood (innocence/naivety, growing up), motherhood (great mother, fertility, sexuality), fatherhood (authority, the wise old man); featuring mutually connected *motifs* of water and earth, death and rebirth, journey; the *coniunctio* and *coincidencia oppositorum* are the organizational structure by which oppositional archetypes function in their duality and unite into a totality.

2. According to Joseph Campbell, there is a universally shared structure of the *hero's journey*, based on Jungian archetypes and originally inspired by Joyce's concept of the *monomyth*. Joyce's narratives, especially *Ulysses*, can be interpreted in the context of this archetypal pattern of the *hero's journey*. Passing through the stages Campbell lays out (*departure, initiation, and return*) the hero forms a full circle in order to achieve revelation and self-realization. From a Jungian point of view, this archetypal structure (*process of transformation*) is the foundation of corresponding transformational myths and folk-tales, which is the basis for further research of the developmental process (*individuation and transformation*) of the literary character.

Having established a thorough literary-critical review on the subject of the dissertation and collating the most representative parts of James Joyce's literary corpus, the results of analyses, based on the aforementioned hypotheses, show a correlation between archetypal structure and Joyce's prose corpus confirming the literary parallel of basic Jungian archetypes, situational archetypes, archetypal characters, and symbols. Furthermore, perfecting the use of

archetypal structures which contains permanent motifs of the human psyche as manifested in literary form, Joyce sets out and solves the problem of individuation and personality transformation. This is one of the fundamental processes that combine his work into a unitive whole.

This doctorate ultimately presents an analytical and critical review of Joyce's prose as a multitude of archetypal structures that must be disassembled for Joyce's works to be more clearly read; therefore, Joyce's prose is better understood in terms of Jungian and archetypal criticism as a guide to the maze of his works.

The text is divided into seven chapters.

The first and introductory chapter provides a brief background of Joyce's literary endeavors, thereafter suggesting that a thread of archetype exists throughout all of them which deserves a detailed study as to gain a clear picture of them and their use.

The second is a theoretical background and methodology opening with an argument that the reading of Joyce is an oxymoron for the reader and a Joycean scholar alike. As one of the solutions to properly reading Joyce, Jungian and archetypal criticism are both suggested, whose application illuminates basic archetypal figures, characters, experiences and motifs. The central part of the chapter focuses on the "nature of the archetype" as its "coiner" Jung explains it to be and as Northrop Frye recognizes it in literature. Jungian criticism is supplemented by that of his students, associates, and sympathizers, such as Jolanda Jacobi, Marie-Louise von Franz, Edward Edinger, Erich Neumann, among others. Afterward *mythos* is proposed as a methodology, as explained and contrasted to the *logos* (Armstrong and Campbell). The final section asserts that archetypal criticism may function to better access Joyce's prose as a "key" to more fully understanding its essence.

The third chapter focuses on *Dubliners* as presented through *paralysis*, *gnomon*, and *simony* which form a triumvirate governing the motifs of the stories. Using them as a prism, the Jungian archetype of the shadow emanates. It is found that the overarching motif of these stories, as shown through the shadow, is the inability for even remote change. The protagonists are prevented from achieving any possibility of initiation and transformation. A strikingly incomplete individuation of characters are presented as well as other archetypes and their related symbolic aspects (*father, mother, church, Ireland, exile, window*). This chapter analyzes the

stories of “The Sisters”, “Araby”, “Eveline”, “A Painful Case” and “The Dead”, including sections of others as needed.

The fourth chapter revolves around *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and opens by detailing the concepts of aesthetics pertinent to the work and why it is important for the use of epiphany. Its theoretical concept as the “archetypal experience” (Beja) is underscored as a starting point of the aesthetics which the young artist strives to develop (Noon). The analysis of the text proper follows the development of the protagonist, Stephen Dedalus, (through stages: partial separation and individuation) according to his overall character arc that emerges through epiphany. The hero-artist is interpreted according to this theoretical framework, as well as all his *personae* (masks). The most important epiphanies are identified and thoroughly reviewed. Moreover, the father/mother complexes, ego inflation, the *anima* and *animus* are all shown as being focal points by which the hero comes to an intimating of his shadow in conflict. The sin as the motif of salvation is elucidated on, leading to the conclusion that the mask is rejected in favor of accepting the true self. Yet, this results in the danger of an archetypal “fall” if that which has been learned does not come to its fruition.

The fifth chapter analyzes *Ulysses* through the archetypal concept of Campbell’s *hero’s journey*, which suggests and theorizes heavily on the concept of a *monomyth* that points to the fact that all mythologies must share and take part within its structure and need not be the same in all narratives. For this reason, the voyages of Odysseus, Hamlet, Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus all contain the same overarching structure. The chapter is divided into sections according to the hero’s journey. The departure makes up the first two chapters of *Ulysses*, “Telemachus” and “Nestor”, as the separation of the hero from the old world resulting in alienation and yearning for wholeness and connectedness to a new one. The journey itself initiates in the “Proteus” chapter. Finally, the epic “Nostos” or return home is read most closely employing the “Ithaca” chapter as a means of reintegration of the self. After examining Stephen, the main focus is transferred to Leopold Bloom as his own protagonist and Stephen’s counterpart. Bloom’s transformation initiates in the “Hades” chapter. The analysis concludes with an examination of the “Penelope” chapter, where the reader is presented with an interpretation of Molly Bloom’s soliloquy according to the semiotics and semiology of Julia Kristeva, as manifesting a harmonization between the events that unfolded and that which has transformed the protagonists through their respective journeys.

The sixth chapter rounding out the analysis of Joyce's literary corpus presents the reader with a process of employing archetypes to serve as the organizing principal behind *Finnegans Wake*. Cyclic myth as a prism of reading is employed on Joyce's own referencing (Vico). On this foundation, a framework is developed in which it is suggested that the work itself is a repetitive structure in which a similar story is told and retold (Eliade) utilizing the same characters, whose names change but are in fact reference points to their duality in origin. The general motif is a cyclic creation of the world and fall of mankind, represented through the oppositional archetypes of *coniunctio* which merge to form a *coincidencia oppositorum*. Corresponding archetypal motifs also stand for respective characters. In essence, the story is of a whole decomposing and recomposing again.

The concluding seventh chapter offers a short review of the general conclusions arrived at, as well as offers a synthesis of Joyce's literary corpus, writing style, and the possibility of an autobiographical reading from his works. It is surmised that since archetypes are the groundwork of his fiction, his biographical facts are merely incorporated and not the origin of the narratives themselves. The final analysis suggests that the key to understanding Joyce's works are the archetypes they are structured around and not the micro-specifics. Further research of detailed archetypal readings is therefore also suggested.

Keywords: James Joyce, archetypal criticism, Jungian criticism, monomyth, hero's journey, archetype, symbol, narrative, cyclic myth, character transformation, individuation

Scientific field: Social Sciences and Humanities

Narrow scientific field: Philology

UDC number:

Contents

1. Introduction: Diving Down the Well of Joyce	1
2. Understanding the Text through Jungian Archetypes as Applied to Literary Criticism	6
2.1. A Difficult but Pleasurable Read	6
2.2. Looming over the Text	7
2.3. The Nature of the Archetype	10
2.4. <i>Mythos</i> as Methodology	31
2.5. Archetypes as Literary Criticism	43
3. <i>Dubliners</i> : A Book of Despair through the Portrayal of Paralysis, Gnomon, and Simony	45
3.1. The Reader Comprehends	45
3.1.1. A Paralytic Text	46
3.1.2. Gnomon: The Archetypal Shadow	50
3.1.3. The Profanity of Simony	55
3.2. Reading <i>Dubliners</i> through Its Shadows	59
3.2.1. The Two of Whom?	62
3.2.2. Calling out to a Drowning Eveline	63
3.2.3. “Araby” – “For Love at first is all afraid”	72
3.3. “The Dead” – “What is a woman a symbol of?”	75
3.3.1. “Lean out of the window”	80
3.3.2. (Im)Possible Reconciliation of a Journey Westward	84
3.4. “A Painful Case” – Mr. Duffy as Gabriel’s Counterpoint	89
3.5. The Irish Shadow of a Moral History	94
4. <i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i> : Character Progression through Epiphany – “an element in <i>all human experience</i> ”	96
4.1. Escaping Paralysis through Epiphany	96
4.2. Joyce and Aquinas Integrated in Epiphany	97
4.3. <i>A Portrait</i> Portrayed in Archetypes	111
4.3.1. Epiphanic Moments as Archetypal Experience	112
4.3.2. Ecce Puer – The Myth of Baby Tuckoo	118
4.3.3. The Image of the Father Corroded – “A father, Stephen said, battling against	

hopelessness, is a necessary evil”	136
4.3.4. The Transformation of the Sin into Self-knowledge	145
4.3.5. The Final Epiphany of the Self – To Live and to Err as One	162
4.3.6. Escaping Temptations and Staying True to the Self	167
5. A Luminous Darkness: Archtexts and Archetypes in <i>Ulysses</i>	175
5.1. Making the Everyday <i>Odyssey</i>	175
5.2. Transforming the Historic into the Eternity – the Monomythic Experience of Hero’s Journey	180
5.3. Departure: “Telemachus” and “Nestor”	190
5.4. Joyce’s Bardism	195
5.5. Initiation: “Proteus”	204
5.6. The Visit to the Dead: “Hades”	209
5.7. “Eumaeus” and “Ithaca”: Return	220
5.8. The Very Own Penelopiad of Molly Bloom	233
5.8.1. The Infamous Yeses of Molly Bloom: A Reading of James Joyce’s “Penelope”	240
6. A Cyclic Retelling of the Tale: Archetypal Opposites in <i>Finnegans Wake</i>	250
6.1. “Ask yourself the answer, I’m not giving you a short question”	250
6.1.1. Eternal Repetition in Myth and History	254
6.1.2. The Prime Archetypes: <i>Coniunctio</i> and <i>Coincidencia Oppositorum</i>	259
6.2. “Wakeswalks Expedition” in Eternity	267
6.2.1. Archetypal Sibling Rivalry: Brotherly Love, Brotherly Hate	271
6.2.2. HCE – His Continual Eternity	277
6.2.3. Making Love for the Whole World to See	281
6.2.4. Anna Livia Plurabelle: The One Worth Staking Everything On	286
6.3. The Fascination with Joycean Proliferation of the Figuration of Enumeration and its Unification	301
7. Epilogue: Concluding Thoughts on Archetypal Criticism and Joyce	303
Works Cited	314
Author’s Biography	327

Abbreviations

- D* Joyce, James. *Dubliners*. Dover Publication, Inc., 1991.
- E* Joyce, James. *Exiles*. B.W. Huebsch Publishing, 1918.
- FW* Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- JJ* Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. 1959. New and Revisited Edition. Oxford UP, 1982.
- MDR* Jung, Carl G., and Aniela Jaffé. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. London: Fontana Press, 1995.
- P* Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Penguin Books, 1996.
- SH* Joyce, James. *Stephen Hero*. Edited from the Manuscript in the Harvard College, Library by Theodore Spencer. Incorporating Additional Manuscript Pages in the Yale University Library and the Cornell University Library. Edited by John J Slocum and Herbert Cahoon. A New Directions Press, 1944. Print.
- U* Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2010.

1. Introduction: Diving Down the Well of Joyce

That the work of an Irishman has had central importance in the prose of modern literary writing perhaps is not the most outlandish statement to make – Becket, Wilde, Swift, Yeats, Shaw, to name but a few of the literary giants originating from that Emerald Isle. However, Joyce stands out even among his peers. Like his Irish literary equals, he wrote in English, aware of its imposition on his supposedly native Celtic tongue, and like those same contemporaries, he not only mastered English, but invented it anew. This should come as no surprise as Joyce was a skilled acquaintance of close to fifteen languages; he was a lover of the spoken and written language alike, a cataloger of names, a craftsman of rhetorical effects, jester of parodies, enumeration, and word play. It is never straightforward if his personal history is laid out, commonly experiencing the trouble of a famous actor who is associated with the mask of the character they take on, but it is assuredly clear that the history and experience of his nation shines throughout his work. Joyce was the Irish expatriate of the ante-World War I order of Europe, outsider to his own home, but never leaving it, carrying with him from city to city in Europe and constantly returning to it in his writing.

Yet, these are not features unique to Joyce and Joyce alone. It was his distinct and perplexing style of writing that has made its imprint on English literature; his employment of stream of consciousness, inner monologue and soliloquy, as well as use of epiphany in his works, have all been puzzled over in depth, by Joyce’s followers and academics alike. The mark of a true artist, Joyce compiled his texts on the micro and macro level with painstaking care to imbibe individual words and sentences with characteristic allusions and symbolism from which passages were made into interlaid units that were knitted together to reach a desired sum of all parts. What is more, Joyce, as a storyteller, carefully painted his literary depiction of Dublin and its characters through use of archetypal structures to place them in a novel light.

Suffering near poverty and financial dependency for much of his life, James Joyce once described himself as “a man of small virtue, inclined to extravagance and alcoholism” (Ellmann, *JJ* 6)¹ to none other than leading psychoanalyst of his time, Carl Gustav Jung. Despite his

¹ To cite references in this paper, the MLA standard according to the eighth edition of the MLA manual are used (*MLA Handbook*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 2016).

INTRODUCTION: DIVING DOWN THE WELL OF JOYCE

misgivings about himself, his life took different turns from stage to stage. Born on the 2nd of February, 1882, in the Dublin suburb of Rathgar, the first stage of his life was his youth, the most significant part of which was his education, concluding in his studies of modern languages at the Jesuits college of Clogowes and Belvedere and at the University College of Dublin. The second stage began with a self-imposed exile, leaving Ireland with the love of his life – Nora Barnacle. Each subsequent stage may be represented through the progress of the publication of his major literary works: releasing *Dubliners* at 32 and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* at 34 demonstrated the most conservative literary style of his life; *Ulysses* at 40 is when he first branched out into the experimental stream of consciousness; and *Finnegans Wake* at 57 in which he broke from all his previous work to create an entirely new form of language and writing.

In spite of the fact that it pales in comparison with its expanse and proliferation against even his contemporaries, Joyce's oeuvre has certainly earned its place as a focal point of study in modern literature. His posthumous celebrity as a writer is not simply due to the quality of the work and its impact on the literary world, but also stems from the simple fact that as his writing progresses, it grows increasingly complex, abstruse, and downright murky for the reader to navigate through. *Dubliners* is perhaps the most accessible work while *Finnegans Wake* is only read by the most ambitious literary lover. Yet even the former, his collection of short stories, is dense, and while it is perfectly comprehensible even by an inexperienced reader, there are layers upon layers that pose a challenge. Therein lies the rub: if there is any thread that runs through his works, it is that Joyce himself admitted to them being written and designed as to be "difficult to read", since his ultimate goal was to create his works using the most varied references and hidden meanings possible in order for them to be discussed for many years hence (see Ellmann, *JJ* 521).

While *A Portrait* is also a novel that has its own depth requiring more than a brief examination of the surface text, Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* have frequently been associated by the common and studious reader alike as being "inaccessible" and elusive in their understanding. These two latter novels represent a clear divide between the early stage of his writings and its mature culmination in which the style took a lucid precedence in the writing. However, they are not dissimilar to those two works of his early career. If there is anything true that may be asserted of Joyce's works, in general, it is that their value lies always within a deeper

reading and cannot come to the surface after the first reading alone. Instead, analysis to spot the usage of symbolism to express the idea inherent to the text requires multiple evaluations.

The mere fact that Joyce is read and studied extensively in spite of the difficulty of the texts begs the question as to why this should be the case. However, the answer stems from the same origin of the question's asking: difficult texts that compel the reader are richer since they require examination to be understood, thereby gaining insight and understanding that is rewarded. To this aim, the main principles of this dissertation are to investigate and provide a clearer perspective of Joyce's fiction along terms that illuminate it from start to finish.

What is difficult for the researcher of Joyce's work is that a writer such as he resists and excludes every possibility of unambiguous classification of style. It is of no assistance that one cannot truly cross-compare one of his works with another as a basis of textual form. Joyce "experimented" with all forms of writing, never repeating one when he had ultimately accomplished it. His early lyrical endeavors were fruitful in giving birth to *Chamber Music* (1907), Joyce's first collection of poems, as well as *Pomes Penyeach* (1927) and other poetry ("Gas from the Burner" and "Eccer Puer"), but he never returned to poetry *per se*. Instead, Joyce followed a collection of short stories *Dubliners* (1914) after which he essentially abandoned the individual short story. Then came his first novel, the re-adapted *Stephen Hero*, a seminal, but mostly autobiographical comparative "bildungsroman" – *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916). As a late modernist work of acclaim, he never returned to the genre. *Exiles* (1918) was his one and only play, unfitting the profundity of his Irish contemporaries and has never been widely performed. His second novel, *Ulysses* (1922), presented in the form of an adapted full epic over the course of a day was not returned to, but its instances of style of pure parody and stream on conscious were taken up again in an extreme form in his infamous *Finnegans Wake* (1939). As is evident, Joyce was an author who always set out to accomplish a new aspiration, something that would propel his work and genius one step further. Each one of these works grew on Joyce's literary skill in the lyrical and incorporated more use of symbolism as the texts progressed. As Ellmann puts it, "his work began in the merest lyric and ended in the vastest encyclopedia" (*JJ* 4).

Nabokov, notorious in his own right for his stylistic complexity and rich overtones, commented that "a great writer is always a great enchanter" (6) equating the author's ability to lure the reader in with the distinct power of his writing. However, much like finding secrets to a

hidden knowledge, when examining an author's work, "we come to exciting part when we try to grasp the individual magic of his genius and to study the style, the imagery, the pattern of his novels or poems" (Nabokov 6). The long-term objective of this dissertation is to establish the pattern Joyce used in his writing from its inception to its culmination as to better understand the troublesome yet enjoyable nature of his works.

Joyce was not a writer of fantasy. Following the nature of the times he lived, he wrote only in a period of late realism which delved into the everyday life of the individual as to inscribe it with literary merit and value, not merely trying to make it grandiose, but to claim that it was worth examination because the stories of a life were valuable for introspection. Joyce, however, eclipsed Henry James or Thomas Hardy or the other literary giants prior to him. He wrote in such a manner that he boiled down the experience in the reality of life to magnify the mundane-ness and profanity of experience into profundity. He transmogrified the profane into the literary; for Joyce "what was the ordinary is extraordinary" (Ellmann, *JJ* 5) and *vice versa*. This is exactly where Joyce's creativity lies, but leads to another of Joyce's paradoxes, since "no one knew what the commonplace reality was until Joyce had written" (Ellmann, *JJ* 5), being confronted by it may also lead to hyper-sense of surrealism which does not assist the reading itself where the commonplace subject is elevated to a means of literary heroism without outright explanation as to why.

What is needed then is a system by which Joyce's literature can be interpreted as to better determine the essence of the works. As concerns the pattern that may be found in the writing, one may see that, as Ellmann suggests, Joyce "joined what others has held separate: the point of view that life is unspeakable and to be exposed, and the point of view that is infallible and to be distilled" (*JJ* 5). However, as this dissertation shall now delve into, the spirits Joyce distilled from them were motifs, archetypes, and symbols which he relied upon stylistically to craft his work, to speak to the reader, and to underscore the individual elements throughout his narratives as to render them both expressively fantastic but based in a reality relatable to the common man. Jung, when speaking of the collective unconscious as it relates to psychology and literature stated that "the raw material of this kind of creation is derived from the contents of man's consciousness, from his eternal repeated joys and sorrows, but clarified and transfigured by the poet" (89; vol. 15). As shall be demonstrated now, in detail, Joyce draws upon the common

INTRODUCTION: DIVING DOWN THE WELL OF JOYCE

experiences of reality to create stories relatable to the reader based upon the archetype and motifs that may be associated within certain constructs that allow for the reader to understand fully the consequence of the writing despite its apparent complexity.

2. Understanding the Text through Jungian Archetypes as Applied to Literary Criticism

2.1. A Difficult but Pleasurable Read

In the canon of Western literature, specifically focusing on the modern, the works of James Joyce stand out as epitomes: read, devoured, and poured over by the semi-academic and the literati alike. Their continued relevance and popularity has stayed with them, nearly a century on from their original publication. Of ready visible support, much can be said of Bloomsday, the 16th of June, which has Dublin see many foreign visitors, not all of whom are even native speakers of English, travel across the city to re-enact the meandering of a seemingly unremarkable day of a handful of characters from Joyce's *Ulysses*. Or the statues of Joyce dotting Europe (Pola, Trieste, Zurich, Paris, Dublin) which are a further testament to the pull the writer has had on popular literary opinion by those who have read his works and those who have not.

This is no small accomplishment as Joyce is not an easy read, *Ulysses* is no book for sheer entertainment and even his more accessible work of *Dubliners* can be lost without the reader's reflection and attention. Inasmuch as Joyce has been studied, his works are also highly annotated, offering insight often into every sentence and debating what certain utterances actually mean or relate to. The challenge of translating his works into foreign languages also remains a conundrum for many, leaving the translator in an awkward position to explain everything in footnotes. In short, it is hardly debatable that Joyce is a difficult author to approach let alone decipher in his literary merit. The plethora and depth to which the reader must explore further into Joyce's oeuvre is a daunting task. Any given work by Joyce, though some more than others, is a web tangled in allusions, motifs, uncommon symbols, intertextuality, remarkable vocabulary and compounded narration. It would seem oxymoronic then that Joyce would be considered such a master of literature as his works may prove inaccessible to the "inexperienced reader" and yet, they remain readable and enjoyable.

This very conundrum of Joyce stems from the fact that the nature of his works includes the essential use of the archetype and archetypal motif as literary means in which associations

actively employed by Joyce synthetically establish a text that may be read both for the reader's pleasure and serious academic reflection. As a result, Joyce's work may and can be readily seen through a prism of correlating literary archetypes and motifs that many if not most stories share.

This work will argue that the interpretation of Joyce's works should rest on their archetypal associations as they are presented in the text as to create an intertextual and congruent whole. The paper does not aim to catalog instances in Joyce's works, but to explore select archetypes that are of continual reappearance in the corpus of the texts and to compare them with archetypal forms and structure to which the text alludes or implies. In order to do so, it will employ the application of literary archetypes as established along Jungian associative grounds as a theoretical framework from which to launch.

2.2. Looming over the Text

A question that receives its due consideration is that of "How can a text be understood?" or even "How is it to be read?" Such an inquisition need not be limited alone to the serious literary undertaking, but rather to the most frivolous work of a pulp magazine as well – it is all encompassing to the literary world. Moreover, while it is unobjectionable to claim that one object of a fictional work is to entertain the reader, there is still much to be discussed as concerns how it does so, or rather, how a text is able to be understood in the way in which it presents itself in its reading.

Approaching any text is comparable to deconstructing a tapestry in which the strands of many varied hues come together to be interwoven into a whole, and, when disassembled, are no longer the once proud adornment that had hung on a wall in moments of received admiration, but that of a tattered mess lying on the floor. Much the same can be said for the deconstruction or literary analysis of a text, whose congruent whole is made up of uniquely disparate parts or strands that freely flow through the work in which their interrelation comes to converge to assemble the work into a totality that functions in concert with itself. Individually, any sentence, any character, any word taken at random is incomprehensible without its supporting structure of the work itself. A text by essence is, "multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation" (Barthes 148). A text, in short, does not stand alone, nor may it, as it is *de facto* reflective from the text's inter-existence with the reader.

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

This is an important point to bear in mind, because, at heart, it raises the question of how are we able to interpret or to understand the text as it is read.

If the text, in and of itself, is indeed to be interpreted as from the manner in which it is understood as read, its “unity lies not in its origin but in its destination” (Barthes 148), i.e. the reader who is “someone who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted” (Barthes 148). A fundamental issue arises from accepting the lack of an externally assigned meaning inherent to the text, which is that even when the variance of an individual interpretation will ultimately assign the “meaning” of a text, a multitude of forms stemming from interpretation therein come forth. Yet, when a text is confronted, read, consumed, interpreted, there would not seem to be a limitless number of interpretations at which to be arrived. Though boundless they may be, interpretations are inherently finite in their number. Consequent to this same supposition, literary analysis, although liberated by intertextual constructs, may also be equally narrowly defined as such when provided for upon the basis of the reading of a text.

This specific issue of the interpretation of a text is further exacerbated as the text of which is consulted in its *jouissance* is not able to be read alone. Not merely does the reader bring their individual experience to the text, but the text *per se* consults an inherent interconnection between textual readings; i.e., the text exists as a participatory body in the wider expanse of literature, as well as that of the human condition. The text and the reader actively contribute to the reading of itself. The text, therefore, is nothing but complex. “The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost” (Barthes 148).

The text in its analysis is that of the ephemeral object, existing in essence and form but never concurrently both in totality at the same time. The text is of the written word, but without its reading, does not exist. Yet, upon its reading, the text comes alive. To wit, the literary text bears value reincarnated upon every reading, which complicates factors of literary analysis as being objective rather than subjective in the investigation into a text by default is to bear a reflection into the reading of it.

To wit, the realm of “fiction” as artistic expression is taken as a given to not be real or accorded to what “truth” is as the “truth” of reality or the “real world”- yet, “truth” can be found inside fiction, more so than upon examination of reality, as has supposedly been attributed to

Camus, “the fiction is the lie through which we tell the truth”.² The reader of a fictional work is aware that the work is imagined, not real, the creation of an artistic endeavor of another’s mind. Yet the reader sees “truth” or takes something which is considered “truth” from the work in its consumption. One of the oldest ancient literary theories of truth is the correspondence theory of truth.³ According to this theory, the truth is defined as the correspondence of language (words, statement, and ideas) and reality. It is certainly not truth “that surrounds us”, a truth that we cannot understand the basic meaning of these words. It is much more, and it occupies theorists to this day. “To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true” (Aristotle 1011b25). A number of corresponding parts also emerge in truth as a sense of coherence, in which the integral yet still incoherent parts, though they may not nor need be directly identical, still share within the given and established order, resulting in a truth taken from the whole as passed down onto its constituent components.

Of course, this theory of correspondence can only apply if also attached to the theory of coherence, as if one body of mutually understood work is not in alignment with others, and there is no general coherence applied to the overall works in which there is reference, then no truth may come of it, due to the fact that nothing may also correspond, given a chaotic and random nature underlying all reference.

The problem of addressing truth in fiction using correspondence theory is that reference must be placed on the external, something which originates outside of the literary work itself, an external factor upon which a basis can be given for reference and hence, truth. Yet, this is limiting as it would deny the originality of the author and their intention, as well as limit the scope in which interpretation may arise, as it can only be confined to “the other”, without only using the simplicity of one literary corpus to find self-reference, meaning, and truth. Consensus theory, on the other hand, seeks no outside external source as the only means of “discovering” truth; instead, it takes truth as a given for that which is expressed as being descriptive in truth, and therefore normative, meaning that a body of work can be analyzed on its own merits in terms

² This is likely a misattribution as there is no actual source inside Camus’ literary corpus or his letters, but, for the purpose of the argument, the statement stands alone as it is.

³ The correspondence theory of truth was first formulated by Aristotle in his *Metaphysics*. He was arguing that the truth of a statement, an opinion, or judgment can be determined only and if only that truth corresponds, i.e., relates to reality. For more on literary theories of truth, especially The Correspondence theory of Truth see, Zalta, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

of what “truth” it portrays to the reader, without need for a correspondence to an external work and without the burden of needing to be in perfect coherence with these other(s).

Edinger posits an important question and provides a valid answer: “Meaning is found in subjectivity. But who values subjectivity?” ... the truth is that human meaning is being sought where it does not exist – in externals, in objectivity” (108).

In vain it would be to take any strictly individual section, any singular scene from a novel or short story, a stanza from an epic, or one mere line of dialogue from a play, to derive sheer “meaning” lying beneath those many lines that flow together and as one. Yet, when approaching a work in its literary merit, one must be reduced at times to examining its individual parts; inasmuch as a text is an assemblage of the varied and multuous, not a uniform, monotonous object, its analysis is multi-layered from the macro to the micro.

Therefore, despite these multiform areas of interpretation, the “truth” of a text remains definable. To avoid the intertextual discussion of the modern, postmodern, and even contemporary age of both academic and popular literary analysis, the text as analyzed must be given a key, a code through which its nature may emerge, and substantial, definable points throughout the text may be understood in its analysis, as well as signs within its reading; i.e., a framework must exist as applicable to the text so that the truth may emerge through systematic investigation.

Given the nature of the text and its examination upon its reading, the key to which its door shall be opened is that of the Jungian archetype in its application to the literary and its analysis, as is the subject hereafter discussed within this paper.

2.3. The Nature of the Archetype

Archetypes, as Jung coined them in terms of codifying the essence of his psychoanalytical theory, were key to understanding and making sense of the world of human thought, giving form to the nonsensical randomness that can befall the mind. In determining a pattern of their seeming repetition, Jung established the concept of the archetype as the eternal form of which thought and the psyche (in its various manifestations) would appear to return to. This has not been lost on literary analysis either, wherein the seemingly archetypal nature of the text and of storytelling have been assigned a place within literary analysis as well, specifically

one that allows for the text to participate in a form greater to it and which has been traditionally both analyzed and criticized structurally as such in comparative terms. Modern comparative literary analysis, whether it be aware of it or not, owes much to the Jungian theory of archetypes, as it allows for a systematic set of given parameters, as defined elsewhere in their psychological terms, (not the aim of this work), to be applied to both form and analysis of the text as it is related. “Critic will apply ... perspectives as the mythological and psychological only as far as they enhance the experience of the art form, and only as far as the structure and potential meaning of the work consistently support such approaches” (Guerin et al. 219). Indeed, though the application of Jungian theory as concerns literary analysis (i.e., focusing on literary archetypes and motifs, as accords the broader pattern into which the fall) is a step removed from the standard use of Jungian theory in its original purposes for psychological examination, it is not removed from accordance with the literary. Undeniably, the application of Jungian theory to the literary is not a controversial means towards analysis.

Of substance for the further exploration of the archetype as it is to be applied in its literary use is the collective unconscious, the content of which is “made up essentially of archetypes” (Jung 42; vol. 9, pt. 1). While the archetype is to be understood as being a pre-existent phenomenon from which the remainder unfolds and from which the collective unconscious both consolidates into and stems, “an indispensable correlate of the idea of the collective unconscious”, (Jung 42; vol. 9, pt. 1) the collective unconsciousness itself is the total aggregate of the archetype before it is given a definite form in use. In one sense, the archetype and the collective unconscious are mutable as the latter is made up of the predetermined materialization of the former; i.e., the collective unconscious is merely the form of the archetype without actualized form thereof. More to the point, the collective unconscious is inherent and “does not develop individually ... It consists of pre existent forms, the archetypes, which can only become conscious secondarily and which give definite form to certain psychic contents (Jung 42; vol. 9, pt. 1). To reiterate, as to be entirely clear, the archetype and the collective unconscious both exist *a priori* to the form by which the archetype occurs in its manifestation. The collective unconscious is primary but the archetype, as a variant of the same, secondary, as it is the overarching but more tangible form that gives the collective unconscious coherent shape. Significant to this interrelation is the permutability between the collective unconscious and

archetype that allows for them to influence the analysis of one another as they are imbricating factors of their wholeness and modeled instances.

More to the point is that the collective unconsciousness, as fundamental to the make-up of the human psyche as according to Jung, is “present always and everywhere” (Jung 42; vol. 9, pt. 1). As the bedrock from which all endeavors of human thought come into their fruition, the archetype is as ubiquitous then as the collective unconscious is far reaching in its expanse. The collective unconscious is the pillar in Jung’s approach to the problem of human psychology with equivocal archetype being keys to deciphering its veiled code behind the unconscious becoming conscious in human psychosis.

The collective unconscious to the archetype and vice versa is delineated by the same argumentation of its binary nature wherein a duality of forms is asserted, one in which the predetermining nature of the spirit of an object both dictates its edifice and consequence. The object thereof transmutes back from its germination into a more clearly realized definition of itself shedding light upon both in the process.

Albeit, this definition of the archetype as it is formed out of the so-coined collective unconscious may appear to be at best happenstance as antecedent and consequent as defining one another, and thereby open to whatever may so be the interpretation of the argument or author, the archetype is in fact “neither a speculative nor a philosophical but an empirical matter” (Jung 44; vol. 9, pt. 1). The boundaries of definition in application are limited to the dual nature of the archetype as is found in jointly and correlated expressed phenomena as related to a duality between it and the underlying collective unconscious. The interpolation of the archetype may not over extend these limits to which its incidence occurs in reality.

Figuratively, the archetype and the collective unconscious are a dyad, but the archetype being the more perceptible of the two to immediate comprehension. Jung expounded that the consciousness of the individual or the more immediate consciousness “is of a thoroughly personal nature” (42; vol. 9, pt. 1) meaning that the archetype is of a unique substance in its actuality, one that takes on its own form as distinct from that of the total collective. Nonetheless, beyond the scope of the more direct form lies “a second psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals” (Jung 42; vol. 9, pt. 1). This pairing can further be utilized to the description of the substance of the archetype as means of analysis,

wherein the personal surface reflects merely an iota of the depth of meaning to which it symbolizes and signifies below the unconscious that is waiting to be uncovered.

The duality of significance being thus defined, Jung's assertion that the collective unconsciousness is the associated and aggregated thoughts of the individual as encompassing all into a common concern that reflects all human thought, the "collective unconscious" or archetype need not be singularly applied autochthonously to its own field of psychological discourse. Imperative in the concept of the two is their underlying duality of which the evident is subject to the substrate form of the non-evident. Jung finds, as is the nature of the analysis, that the sub-form of the archetype as it lurks within the collective unconscious to be that which adds the given meaning to the archetype, or, as he so aptly stated, "there is something that is behind, beneath, beyond, or as yet unseen on the surface to what is at hand and which is not yet clear" (42; vol. 9, pt. 1). Therein, the actual psychological nature of the collective unconscious need not concern literary archetype as it falls outside the bounds of necessitating an inherently mutual common ground in which the sheer *nature* of the archetypes as a whole are subject to the nature of human consciousness. Instead, the literary interest of the archetype falls within the realm of associated comparative literature in which the mutual correlation of repeated narratives can be interpolated to arrive at mutual parallels that are the literary archetype. It is of interest to the expanse of a cultural, literary whole to which the archetype of the written word is to be analyzed, and not the wider aspect of the human unconscious.

The concept of the collective unconscious is of import in the application of the archetype to the literary as it portends that there exists something to which archetypes may relate and from which they emerge, while still maintaining that they are not wholly the same. Therein, archetypes inasmuch as they are to be implicit in the forthcoming work in their direct applied usage in literary terms which are to be first defined by the Jungian concept of a structured pre-existence giving rise to forms of incidence. Archetypes do emerge in their actual usage, especially within the literary world, but simply relate to the archetype and do not actually define what the archetype is itself, much the same as Jung's theory of the collective unconscious does. Moreover, this limited but essential view of the archetype is to also provide a finality and to encompass their broad expanse by which means of pure literary analysis would otherwise prove infeasible to conduct or insatiable to prove in evidence.

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

In like manner, the archetype in its literary usage is that which acts in accordance with indirect elucidation of the typical form to which its instance in use takes hold, becoming a specimen of its species as it were. The archetype speaks in broad strokes which often lie beyond the bounds of a strictly logical argument in which their actual item portends to an underlying form that surpasses it. The archetype can be understood weakly only through a direct means of comparison when its form is the only object analyzed; instead, it is the use of the archetype in its symbolized form that speaks to its nature and allows for the work to be analyzed not only among its own archetypes but, when overlapping with others, allows for a cross sectional, multi-textual analysis as well, or as Frye advocates, “[P]oetry can only be made out of other poems; novels out of other novels” (*Anatomy of Criticism* 47).

Support of such an expression of archetype wherein it flows naturally from a shared foundation may be also derived from Jung’s interlinked concept of individuation. As Jung would have it, the identity of the individual ego is formed upon the process of association with the individual interpretation of the archetype as collective unconscious in which the individual’s interpretation and understanding acts as one further step removed from its base and one more instance of an actual utilization stemming from the overall collective use of archetypes into its own individualized being. In a more substantive and videlicet nature, archetypes may be absolute forms of an ideal, but the individuation of them in the conspicuous nature by which they come forth is the actual language by which they can be first grasped and discussed further.

In Jungian individuation, as concerns the psyche, the ego reflects upon its own experience as compared to the collective unconscious. By doing so a process of creating an individual nature attached to the original occurs. It is through this exact interaction by which the individual becomes differentiated from the whole that is greater and more dynamic to it. Individuation makes the intangible, tangible, as it were. Individuation, Jung remarks, in the particular; it is “the development of the psychological individual as a differentiated being from the general, collective psychology” (561; vol. 6). Along Jungian lines, it would therefore appear that the archetype is both framed from and is manifested by itself, but the exemplar of categorically individual archetypes are *individuated* from the whole to take on their own characteristics, unique to themselves, but still not violating the authenticity of their origins. “Individuation, therefore, is a *process of differentiation*, having for its goal the development of individual personality” (Jung 561; vol. 6). In terms of further analysis, the individuation of the

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

archetype may be the final consequent of its end, the manifestation complete of an ideal form encompassing three layers of increasing tangible embodiment.

Based on this course, by which the collective unconscious is converted into the corporeal idea, it could be interpreted that the intent of the individualized form of the archetype is to be inherently original and not plagiarized from the source, while still deriving meaning from its origins and partaking in the same form of its germination. In this sense of the archetype, its enduring reappearance is not one that grows repetitive but is one that assuringly has its own shape that is by nature original though not necessarily novel. Yet, such an argument is a fallacy that confirms a negative upon itself. Being novel does not necessitate the value of “new” rather of originality, which the archetype receives in its manifestation. What is crucial is that no one instance may be the same as the other, yet all speak individually and in unison. Still, as an equal effect of the same, every instance of the archetype found in use can be seen to be both relating to other instances while partaking in the domain of the archetype and adding to in its own path of individuation and differentiation, thereby creating a rich field in which to explore not only human psychology, as it aims, but all of the humanities.

The literary archetype emerges in existence from its generative ideal, offering the impetus of creation to the form of which the archetype is established as item, that is, a pattern written that is actual and palpable in its literary nature in the text. The idea itself is the originator to which the final form is applied, and while the form in which it is given birth defines the archetype to what it is, the actual written use of the archetype in its nature remains beyond the reach of its mere use. In short, the archetype is predefined, and archetypal literary criticism may be forced to evaluate archetype based on the temporality of the paragon, as it is only the physical that can be tempered. It is actually the relationship of the two that is of interest to literary criticism as it evokes a synthetic understanding.

In the purest literary sense, archetypes as applied throughout a text are manifold. They are not only the archetypes as embodied within the text in their innate forms as they take hold to specific narrative instances, but also the individual representations of shared relations that correspond to one another throughout all works of literature, as well as correspond to the interrelation of cultural traits which are necessary to understanding them (i.e., any cultural value that may be assigned to a given symbol). Such nature is due to the fact that as a general form lacking a specificity of detail but pertaining to a broad *arcing* pattern, the archetype remains

unique in its own conception while being adaptable to an independent context, hence emerging in a countless number of instances but always of the singular form from which it is derived. “Archetypes are not determined as regards their content, but only as regards their form and then only to a very limited degree” (Jung 79; vol. 9, pt. 1). As has already been noted above, in its essence, the archetype is a top down defined agent, not one that is bottom up. It transcends content as “the invisible presence of the crystal lattice in a saturated solution” (Jung 149; vol. 11), which allows for content to flow freely through it to create a form of the archetype but not the archetype itself. It is but the mold to which it adheres and is shaped, merely providing “a possibility of representation which is given *a priori*” (Jung 79; vol. 9, pt. 1). Consequently, as a result of its fluid form and molding, the form of the archetype is free to transform itself and be applied in a transcendent nature, “the representations themselves [of the archetype] are not inherited, only the forms” (Jung 79; vol. 9, pt. 1). Archetype, in substance, is the ideal model by which its existence is tangibly perceived through what it gives creation to.

Much like the platonic conception of the ideal form, Jacobi has expressed a relationship between the ideal and the temporal, noting that, “the ‘Idea’ appears within the categories of space and time in the realm of creation ... in the form of an ‘eidolon’, then this eidolon, like the ‘perceptible archetype’, combines a timeless factor (idea) and a temporal – material factor (mode of manifestation)” (*Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 50). Such then is also the concept of the literary archetype: a literary form existent in the text that corresponds to the inherent structure of the literary as well as the coherent nature of the text as compared to its experience. Or, perhaps more aptly, the archetype is a living force, giving rise to a multitude of its own creation; as Karen Armstrong has alluded, it is “a philosophical version of the ancient myth of the divine archetypes, of which mundane things are the merest shadow” (39).

While the archetype is then the essential form that emerges out of the seemingly random cacophony of the free association to its genitive nature, the base condition of its core aspects always result in a similar pattern that can be comprehended when seized upon, en force. *Pattern* here is the key word that explains the use of archetype in its totality for analysis, as though a loss of recognition would seem to be inevitable when compiling a sheer compendium of all literary experience, but, when the volume of it is examined, the consequential does arise in its recognition. In such manner has Jung remarked as for dreams, as even though the inherent randomness of the dream world may be daunting to find, the logical within “dreams can

eventually be reduced to certain basic patterns” (*Man and His Symbols* 26-7). In like manner can the accidental of the literary be assigned its own meaning in like analysis wherein the patterns given to the literary compass of humanity’s literary corpus appear.

The archetype as it is expressed into a textual or individualized use equal in that the main archetype in theory is but the assembled shadows of all those that are germane to it, arriving at its own tangible distinctions through formulation in its instances. In this respect, the individual item of the archetype is of more character, but its amalgamation in the main form is the overtly complex in the accumulation by which it pertains in broad archetypal strokes. Much as “the psychological individual is characterized by its peculiar, and in certain respect, unique psychology. The peculiar character of the individual psyche appears less in its elements than in its complex formation” (Jung 560; vol. 6). Yet, the authenticity thereof in the archetype is when it appears contextually in its manifestation as it individuates itself from the main generalized form, as guaranteed by the nature of the archetype to be individualized in the goal of self-extrication wherein the psychological character of an individual “is to come over closer to the realization that his own personal, unique individuality is identical with the eternal archetypal *individual*” (Edinger 157). Therefore, both the ideal concept of the archetype and the form into which it is molded act as a duet, underscoring one another, as do the two tone harmonies of a musical performance by the same name.

Commenting to further this concept of inherent duality, Jacobi delves deeper and relegates the question of the archetype in use from the viewpoint of the conscious and unconscious to the corresponding double nature of the archetype: “the individuation process represents a dialectical interaction between the contents of the unconscious and of consciousness” (Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 115). As has been thus noted that the archetype is a specimen that may be taken as a symbol of the whole to which it pertains, the individuation process further codifies a system in which the archetype may function as a symbol to its own substance as it is represented in a given form. The archetype seen in use acts as but a token of its pretense, the background of which deserves further analysis as it is but an object carrying the content, but not the meaning. Archetypes as seen in their representation serve as symbols that “provide the necessary bridges, linking and reconciling between the two ‘sides’” (Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 115). This duality of the archetype to its ideal and individualized substantive forms make it of extreme value when it is utilized for analytical

purposes as the dialectal nature permits the issuance of analysis to be conducted on the basis of both the final object as phenomena and its origination as ideal, as well as incorporating the duality of the two to synthesize them as one.

As now established, archetypes are herein taken as demonstrative categorical units from which essential evidence of signified meaning can be also equally derived. Archetypes are applicable in their form to an external idea that emerges independently in form (as in a text) and can act as an outside source of which corresponding forms may be extracted and analyzed. They function as defining symbols to which a text may emerge and the reader may be guided in their reading. Moreover, as according to their use in literary analysis, they offer substantial grounding from which pertinent and actual interpretation may be properly concluded and not merely guessed upon.

A counter-argument which must now be raised to the use of archetype in literary analysis may be that archetype by classification is one that does not seek to specifically categorize according to criteria that delineate exacting models from which subspecies might even be determined. It is fair to note that the archetype may be considered too broad a skeleton upon which the flesh of argument may form thereby not lending itself to the narrow definition needed to confirm the posit of a hypothesis or, even, thesis. While there is substance to this claim, it assumes that strictive criteria need be the singular option for analysis. Indeed, while this may be true in the sciences where experimentation allows for quantifiability, the humanities are not so easily numbered and, due to their mutable and clouded nature, lend themselves to an open analysis, based upon a system of open substantial classification. As such, the archetype need not be directly exclusive but inclusive to incorporate the total encompassing structure of its authority.

If archetypes are communicable symbols ... we should expect to find ... a group of universal symbols. I do not mean by this phrase that there is any archetypal code book which has been memorized by all human societies without exception. I mean that some symbols are images of things common to all men, and therefore have a communicable power which is potentially unlimited. (Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 118)

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

The archetype, as in evidence of use, retains unique qualities available to its own specification and classification. Much as the archetype as referenced bears but generalities, its exemplification in the process of its individuation is that which provides substance to its analysis and which allows it to act as a functional cross section from which further accord in its analysis may follow due to the fact that it may be classified as belonging to a trilateral structure of an ideal (main) archetype, archetype as individualized (manifested) in its usage, and, as shall here be discussed, the archetype as symbolic in line with situational settings as a system of interaction within a self and associated framework encompassing other instances of individualized archetypes.

The multiple nature of the archetype as applied to literary analysis is a harmonization of both the archetype as it appears on the page in its individualized form of a substantial nature, as well of a comparison to its main form existent as a form exterior to it, meaning that any given archetype need not be limited to the framework of its own narrative but may draw on others to buttress its literary merit (at least, where evidence proves applicable). To illustrate, when a narrative is examined, it can be more often than not that the mere allusion of one word or even the events of a narrative as a whole, a motif, are spoken of in terms of what else they may mean and to what may be found relevant to them. Frequently, the observant reader finds themselves comparing what the archetype is when it appears in the text to that which is relatable, on the personal experience of the reader, to the story proper, or to another narrative which the reader has consumed or is familiar with. In this regard, here archetype obeys many different varying literary functions of comprehension and inclusion within a sphere of the literary context. Yet, it also may be re-engineered in that the archetype can be removed and analyzed on its own merits to access the essential in the narrative itself.

In literary terms, the archetype as used in practice also serves to bring the reader through a journey in which their own interpretation of the archetypal experience within the text is further individualized to the reader's experience and, through which, the textual becomes more readily apparent. This is to say that when a reader engages a narrative, the storytelling mechanism of the narrative takes hold and archetypes act as actuators along the way which elicit the reader to translate them as according to their pre-established nature based on the already known experience of the reader as related to personal and literary experience. This itself is a semi-uniform approach that acts both universally and individually along the same lines as the act

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

of individuation within the collective unconscious (read: assemblage of archetypes) does in which the reader adds yet another layer of discourse to the archetype as its internalization becomes associated with other literary bodies that may be brought along together with it.

The text, through such an interlinking device as is the pertinence of the archetype, is set free in analysis by being both a part of the whole and its own unique being. Indeed, Frye goes so far as to state that to learn of one text, at least in the modern sense of the word, one must associate it with another, lest the nature to which it shares in the whole literary experience be lost in its entirety:

If we do not accept these archetypal or conventional elements in the imagery that links one poem with another, it is impossible to get any systematic mental training out of the reading of literature alone. But if we add to our desire to know literature a desire to know how we know it, we shall find that expanding images into conventional archetypes of literature is a process that takes place unconsciously in all our reading. (*Anatomy of Criticism* 100)

Be it as it may that Frye distinguishes the consumption of the narrative as an unconscious act as it is associated with a wider wealth of literary resource, it is through the archetype that the interconnection and the essence of the archetype to the importance of the meaning of the work, particularly in its associations for analysis, which shines through in his statement of the archetype.

Furthermore, though logically evident without much need to elaborate, the same relationship of reader to text to archetype functions in a converse manner to the author to text to archetype dynamic of which the spark of creation takes form from the artifice of archetype and, yet, is transformed or individuated in concert with archetype and through the application of its literary nature as compared to its individual identity against other works corresponding to it.

Here then are the bases upon which the archetype as means to analysis stand. Archetypes themselves are the skeletal means by which narrative elements are given birth to and allow the literary creation to take tangible shape as it comes forth. They are the essence of what is manifested within the text, its purest ideal so to speak, in individuated natures as collate to those of another in regards to the fact that while they share in the same foundation they do not in the

same conclusion. The archetype, by definition, is a freestanding form from which the identity is derived of a given instance of its use. While the actual usage of the archetype may relate to the encompassing form to which it correlates, which need not be singular in nature when compared against the many, the case of archetypes is that of multiple repeated instances of usage retaining the character of a singular pattern to which the general term can be assigned as belonging to this, that, or such defined *archetype*. Jung himself defines archetypes as the “factors and motifs that arrange the psychic elements into certain images ... but in such a way that they can be recognized only from the effects they produce. They exist precociously, and presumably they form the structural dominants of the psyche in general” (149; vol. 11). On a literary basis, archetypes stand in the same fashion as being the accumulated association of multiple instances within the breadth of the cultural heritage of literature, or to put it more precisely as Frye has defined, “a symbol, usually an image, which recurs often enough in literature to be recognizable as an element of one’s literary experience as a whole” (*Anatomy of Criticism* 365). Though Frye emphasizes the literary, Jung specified the same for the archetype as being “the primordial image ... a figure ... that constantly recurs in the course of history and appears wherever creative fantasy is freely expressed” (81; vol. 15). What is key is that the archetype is the primary element in the act of creation to which the instance of it may be drawn to on a conclusionary basis from the artifice of its singular origin, which, though manifold, incessantly is of “one” but yet of not “one”.

This dual nature established, it must be stressed that while the archetype may be relegated to but a single function of analysis in comparative literature in which the many may be folded into the one, this is not its sole purpose. The many instances of the actual item from which the archetype emerges in artistic quality are but germane to the respective archetype itself and are not conclusively determined in their final outcomes by the archetype proper. Archetype serves as a gathering point of classification that sheds illumination on the item of its own creation, but does not define its essence inasmuch as that of the archetype neither defines its own individuation, but, rather, “categorizes” it as a species of one literary element. On these grounds, archetype is thereby a participatory phenomenon that can be utilized as a framework for analysis and interpretation. Frye even goes so far as to state that this form allows further insight into all aesthetic mediums and any incorporated tangential aspects thereof. For the written word, as example, he was of the opinion that the linguistic qualities of speech were but one aspect while

in the consideration of the literary wherein “its words form rhythms which approach a musical sequence of sounds at one of its boundaries and form patterns which approach the hieroglyphic or pictorial image at the other” (Frye, “The Archetypes of Literature” 508). Frye here intonates that the interposition of both the cadence of speech and its melody with the text combine to create a higher degree of correspondence that enriches the meaning and interpretation. While Frye is merely incorporating yet another (necessary) layer into a total textual interpretation through associated morphology as well as the reminiscence of speech for the reader or participant of a text in order to draw on relevant associations from a linguistic standing, the dissected nature of the text in which relevance is supplied to extra-textual features is what is here important. Typical areas pertinent to the text, though not necessarily evident, are as important for the ends to analysis as are the direct features provided, such as the morphological nature of speech or even the associative qualities of the mind in the process of analyzing the text. It could therefore be soundly argued that, when this logic is pursued to its subsequent end, it would also allow for the association of anything relevant to bear upon the archetype in its application as it creates a whole. As Frye again purports in support of this assertion, he states that “we may call the rhythm of literature the narrative, and the pattern, the simultaneous mental grasp of the verbal structure, the meaning or significance. We hear or listen to a narrative, but when we grasp a writer’s total pattern we ‘see’ what he means” (“The Archetypes of Literature” 508). It can therein be understood what taking the totality of a text into account to achieve insight in its analysis may pertain. This itself would necessitate that the archetype is but the bare bones upon which further ornamentation lie, but not disclude its core function.

Frye goes on to argue that for these reasons in which textual interpretation is capable of utilizing aspects intrinsic to but otherwise may be considered on the periphery of textuality that experimental writing offers keen discernment into the what the nature of the text can be and what is imperative to textual analysis through the active usage of such independent but innate elements.⁴ Literary analysis as based upon archetype should be no exception to the inclusion of contributing external factors to it in which the association of all archetypal forms relevant to the text may bear upon a given example when utilized by the author.

⁴ “The attempts to get as near to these boundaries as possible form the main body of what is called experimental writing” (Frye, “The Archetypes of Literature” 508).

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

The archetype, as it were, does not stand on its own, rather it falls into associative clusters, which also exist as complex variables, wherein “often a large number of specific learned associations ... are communicable because a large number of people in a given culture happen to be familiar with them” (Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 102). This would suggest that archetype as category follows an innate associative process that is reliant upon the symbolic existent within the tacitly agreed upon semiology of a group. To wit, as opposed to merely an “idea” or “sign” of the conception of an object *per se*, the archetype bears a distinct greater advantage in use of being productive and fluid agents; their sheer nature allowing for a plurality of their manifestation in form as “over against the clarity of the Idea, the archetype has the advantage of dynamism” (Jacobi *Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 50). Yet, if then the kernel of the idea can be represented as perceptible through its own tangible distinction, the archetype must be a panopticon of its own making in which even smallest detail, though symbols, are relatable to an ever more encompassing totality.

Bearing this associative aspect of the symbol in context in mind, while Jungian archetypes inherently stem from Jung’s defined collective unconscious, they are assigned meaning *post facto*; yet, for the literary, the meaning is not instantly recognized as *ipso facto* from a preconceived theoretical standpoint without an analysis of the text inherent, rather, as concerns the nature of the text as it aligns with others, the archetype emerges. More precisely, the literary archetype, even when based upon Jungian discourse of the pre-established archetype which is form fitting, correlates with the symbolization from the text and not *a priori* construct *in toto*. Extrapolating specifically upon this point and designating the literary archetype’s distinction as “a symbol which connects one poem [literary work] with another” (Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 99) and as a consequence “helps to unify and integrate our literary experience” (99). Frye goes on to stress that since archetypes are in essence symbols that aim to communicate levels of semiotic meaning within their context, “archetypal criticism is primarily concerned with literature ... as a mode of communication. By the study of conventions and genres, it attempts to fit [literary work] poems into the body of poetry [literary works] as a whole” (Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* 99). Therefore, archetypes within their literary analysis naturally pertain to and self-categorize into bodies divergent and disparately hinged on the relative truth of their propositions related to one another in the literary encompass of their symbolic and semiotic meaning, and are

not naturally predetermined in the form into which they will take but rather associate themselves freely.

Still, while archetypes speak of the common origin of the vacillating forms they take, it is odd that the archetype itself is not a language or a symbolic form of a meta-language through which an object may receive direct interpretation even when it stems from the object of its own creation; i.e., the archetype is a way to discuss the placement and interpolation of symbols, but they may not be a system of symbols themselves which, taken together, may convey a language of sorts. To clarify further, the designation of belonging to an archetype is not enough to analyze a text, but only to recognize a paradigm. The archetype is external to itself, able only to act as the base parameter from which the remainder issues forth. The forms in which archetypes emerge or are displayed are the manner in which the interpretation of the archetype may be conducted, as well as the only means of their true analysis since they are a closed, self-referential group of experience. Furthermore, the forms of which all archetypes in a given sample, such as in a novel, are found are also only defined as belonging to a particular archetype when defined in their mutual-correlation that play out in the text as the archetypes are realized, forming a language of signs and symbols upon which an analysis of them may occur. The actual language upon which a literary archetype can be analyzed then is therefore merely the symbols they pertain to in their formation within the text and not as archetype alone. Jung himself specifically guards against archetype used for direct interpretation. He insists that the form in which the archetype is shown be taken into due account as well and stresses that archetypes are but “the psychic residua of innumerable experiences of the same type. ... the mythological figures are themselves products of creative fantasy and still have to be translated into conceptual language” (Jung 81; vol. 15). Such a language only can emerge in its actualization, not its theorization. Archetypes, in this regard, are “only the beginnings of such a language” (Jung 81; vol. 15). Archetype acts through its appearance to allow the reader to interpret the text and for a basis of its interpretation to even exist.

In order to maintain the coherency demanded by strict analysis, a system must be examined through its own reflection into an oculus according to which its many disparate actors may come together and be formed into an understanding of congruency. To wit, the method by which the particular language of the archetype may be differentiated from the random white noise of the text is when its forms solidify and cohere as a firm but unique unit of

correspondence. Whether a singular usage of a word or a construct of many pages or passages, its form signifies more than itself, i.e., when it can be read or understood as that of something else beyond its own presentation, the form itself functions as symbol pertaining to the archetype. To put it differently, as Jung has stated, “a word or an image is symbolic when it implies something more than its obvious an immediate meaning” (*Man and His Symbols* 17). As with individuation and the duality of archetype in form of its essence and substance, the symbol as systematic to its origins is but another duality enumerated in the use of archetype.

The interpretation of the archetype as symbol as given may dwell on two distinct layers: 1) the direct symbol, and 2) its associated but underlying significance, either its internal associated nature within its own semiotics or externally significant as correlated within the overlying expanse of the archetype to other instances outside but akin to the symbology established. Implicit there within the symbol lies also the correspondent whole upon which it derives meaning by being an integral part of two halves (though corresponding to more than a mere duality) of which, in unity, create an assigned meaning that is regarded as the symbolic nature of representation inherent thereof to the symbol, which, as a result, is to be regarded as an interdependent complementary aggregate that only comes to the point of its “meaning” when viewed congruently, as much as a puzzle comes to be seen as a picture when all pieces are accounted for and assembled as one. Edinger points out specifically the etymology of the word ‘symbol’ to justify this same nature, commenting that it is, in its essence, derived from the Ancient Greek, ‘that which has been thrown together’ (130).⁵ A step can be taken further to accentuate the need of the symbol, as well that of the archetype to which it portends, for the assemblage of its associated elements only demonstrate a whole greater than the parts when in sum, as one segment without congruence to another signifies nothing, archetypes may be found only when symbol will relate directly to them as well. Nothing is to be found *in vacuo*. Resorting again to etymological discourse, Edinger also notes that a symbol was “originally a tally referring to the missing piece of an object which, when restored to, or thrown together with, its

⁵ “The word symbol derives from the Greek word *symbolon* which combines two rootwords, *sym*, meaning together or with, and *bolon*, meaning that which has been thrown together” (Edinger 130).

partner recreated the original whole object” (130). This itself bespeaks of the meaning created upon the wealth of symbols as amassed, particularly in the process of the narrative and its literary criticism, of analyzing such symbols to reach into the text and draw out the essence upon which it alludes or displays as symbols are natural in reference to one another. Ultimately, these individual sections may be seen to revolve around archetype as the ultimate echelon and the understructure which supports them, to which they all refer when comprehended as *one*. “The symbol leads us to the missing part of the whole man. It relates our original totality” (Edinger 130). As this relates to how symbols are able to function within the framework of archetype, symbols are but one more manifested correspondence to the archetype as it takes form and which can be related back to the archetype, but function as the most atomic units thereof.

Frye, with an eye on the cultural, has classified the latter as being between those archetypes which are naturally associated and those which have inherent cultural value, in which one symbol lends itself to something more existent outside of its sole symbolic nature. For instance, as according to Frye’s example, “as an archetype, green may symbolize hope or vegetable nature or a go sign in traffic or Irish patriotism as easily as jealousy” (*Anatomy of Criticism* 102). Here then can be seen what is meant by a language of symbols within a context, but what is of more import is that the symbol itself can maintain its own standard definition or role within a given symbolic construct that is separate but takes on an additional associated meaning when coupled to another symbol, creating that which is new and as equally comprehended as an archetypal association. In plainer English, symbols together add up to create their own meaning which may not be at hand without their coupling. Frye, for instance, specifically cites that “the word green as a verbal sign always refers to a certain color” (*Anatomy of Criticism* 102), read: green itself is not an archetype in its standard definition but when the symbol receives an assigned counterpart in its pre-existent/established association can come to form or fit an archetype in the text that may address further concerns than merely the initial symbols involved.

To illustrate this point further, as is within direct scope of this examination, the colors of orange, white, and green *per se* are mere hues that stand as semiotic signs of color, but, when combined and in association with already pre-established symbols, they associate to yet another sign – perhaps an object. Such phenomena is to be found in Joyce’s short story “Two Gallants” – the ginger beer and peas on a white plate ordered by one of the main characters becomes the Irish

flag through association of the story, itself heavy in undertones of Irish society and aimed at an Irish audience who would clearly interpret it, with a textual eye, as relating to a flag of the same tri-colors.⁶ This symbol in unison, however, is not a metaphor as it clearly represents another to those involved, if it were to act as one object in similarity to or in relation to speak of another. What lies beyond the symbol of the flag itself is still open to debate, but the association can clearly be made. It could be surmised that the pattern of the flag in its green, white, and orange tri-color banner is evident in the story only based upon the fact that it is merely a narrative dealing with the Irish provincial capital of its times, yet the reader need not see nor pay direct attention to the fact; it is but one enriching detail among many. It is apparent upon closer inspection, even in its tangential nature, as it is established upon such foundations, and may lead as one unit to other such archetypes as *the nurturing mother* or *the overbearing mother*. Moreover, the story in context may act as a total metaphor mirroring that of another, not just as symbol, but even so far as allegory that speaks on a basis of archetype.

It should be noted that the consumption of the text as it is read necessitates recognition of such symbols and, as this paper portends, to illuminate them further. The concept thereof of Jungian archetypes as applied to literature serve “to make the symbolic process conscious” (Edinger 113) of those symbols that are passively understood (i.e., unconsciously) but not actively comprehended (consciously). Yet, “to become conscious of symbols we first need to know how a symbol behaves when it is unconscious” (Edinger 113). In other words, an understanding (which has thus been laid out) of how the symbol is actualized in its use is essential to such understanding archetypes.

In this same vein of literary analysis, the result of symbols such as is found in the above example of the Irish flag, necessitates a clear and active reading of it to emerge, as well as a conscious association for it to come to light. In the same manner, despite their living and dynamic form in which they are to be found and to spawn into new forms, archetypes do not prove by default to be evident from first glance without an active openness to their view. Indeed,

⁶ “Bring me a *plate* of *peas*,” he said, “and a bottle of *ginger* beer” (D 35, emphasis added).

much as when symbols function to the aim of their constituent parts to the whole, a guaranteed view as to their intended meaning is not a foregone guarantee. Metaphor, in contrast, when recognized in the reading, is non-interpretive when based on the symbols directed to it as it speaks directly to the reader based upon the given symbols. Lakoff and Johnson underscore that “two parts of each metaphor are linked only *via* an experimental basis and that is only by means of these experimental bases that the metaphor can serve the purpose of understanding” (20) which is to imply that symbols in their congruency can lead to the understanding of their implied object (albeit as a metaphor) which is outside the realm of symbol and is of mere direct analysis and interpretation.

Archetype, in its symbolic aspects, may also prove problematic to recognize without a trained eye or view to its existence since the two parts may seem inevident. Edinger is of the mind that “symbols have valid and legitimate effects only when they serve to change our psychic state or conscious attitude” (11). Consciousness of the unconscious association clearly comes here into play, much as Jung notes in this relation of the active seen archetype that “whether a thing is a symbol or not depends chiefly upon the attitude of the consciousness considering it” (603; vol.6). Moreover, Jacobi also stresses that it would be perfectly natural for the non-receptive mind to detect no archetypal imagery or association, since “it is perfectly possible that for one man the same fact or object represents a symbol and for another only a sign” (*Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 83). To this same regard, in short, the interaction of archetype as symbol can only be recognized if the participant has the foundational clarity and conscious view as to its recognition. The archetype as in its application to the literary requires this exacting approach in which its symbolical view sheds further light upon its existence of the text as to enrich it.

Matters as to unlocking the symbolic within the evident ambiguity to the archetype are further complicated by the elemental foundations of the symbol as necessity being an indirect means to its object. Signs receive a direct, non-implied meaning, establishing them as functional units that can be drawn upon as an immediate means of analysis. Yet symbols, in order to imply their significance towards their subject matter, are coordinated through their implication, and are, therefore, non-substantive singular units that can always remain open and non-apparent. Edinger has commented on the need of the symbol to take on such an inconspicuous nature to allow it to fulfil its function, stating that “an unconscious symbol is lived but not perceived” (113). As

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

concerns archetype as related to symbol, it is through multiple uses of symbol of which the archetype is arrived at and is yet still inconclusive in all forms of evidence as to its final end. Edinger makes this assertion in which the dynamic nature of the archetype allows it to take form, but it does so unconsciously by being channeled into the patterns which it may flow, but still remain elusive. Edinger specifically underscores the fact that “the dynamism of the unconscious symbol is experienced only as a wish or an urgency toward some external action” (113), meaning that in the literary the unconscious desire of itself takes its own form in the archetypal presentation, but “the image behind the urgency is not seen” (113). Lakoff and Johnson are of the same opinion, but only for metaphor, claiming that they “have entailments through which they highlight and make coherent certain aspects of our experience. A given metaphor may be the only way to highlight and coherently organize exactly those aspects of our experience” (156). The conclusion is that archetype, as existent outside of its own usage is always presented in symbolic form; yet, when compiled in specific or designated use in its reading, the recognition of it allows for singular uses as signs to be interpreted.

The archetype as a collective unit received from a synergy of complimentary symbols is addressed by Edinger, who is of the opinion that archetypes are a natural extension of the need of man for “a world of symbol and sign” (109). Yet it is pertinent to further discuss the notion as relates to the function of literary archetypes that, as Edinger also makes clear, “both signs and symbols are necessary but they should not be confused with one another” (109). The import of symbols and signs to the associative process of understanding, as well as the means by which the sign may be understood through the use of its symbols, is not to be erroneously confused as synonymous in their nature as each are particular to their own essence. While a sign acts as “a token of meaning that stands for a *known* entity” (Edinger 109), as a concrete manifestation of another that is known and from which it receives its essence as an entity that corresponds, a symbol does not share this relative nature of one entity to another, but rather, “is an image or representation which points to something essentially unknown, a mystery” (Edinger 109). To clarify, the sign is that which is understood as that which refers to another. The sign by such fact is known but the symbol is non-inherent in knowing or understanding what it pertains to. Edinger admits by this definition that “language is a system of signs, not symbols” (109) as language itself always refers to an agreed upon series of set meanings, albeit complex and not entirely complicit in having a direct and finite meaning. In essence, “a sign communicates abstract,

objective meaning” (109). Yet, as concerns the function of the literary archetype, they are therefore majority relegated to the symbol, as, has been noted elsewhere above, their meaning is not delineated according to a strict sign. What is more, they are subjective, stemming from individual circumstance, as they do not specifically denote any single given meaning as the sign, but are explored within their meaning as the archetype is explored itself in its context, in its dynamic symbolic form.

Jung supports the multi-significance of the archetype as symbol, designating the use of symbols as a means of conveyance upon the archetype to be the actual signifier between the two, not the erstwhile associative concept of the Freudian direct sign wherein one image or instance is supposedly defined and intended to be the correspondent. Jung states that “those conscious contents, which give us a clue, as it were, to the unconscious background are incorrectly called symbols by Freud. They are not true symbols, however, since according to his theory they have merely the role of *signs* or *symptoms* of the subliminal processes” (70; vol. 15).

The symbol cannot be held as symbol unto itself, merely the symbols partakes or shares in the *teleiosis* of which it represents. It is but of one instance in which the entirety is understood through an indirect means that merely directs but is not immediate. To clarify, Jung goes on to explain that the true symbol, as it is to be understood, is in complete disagreement with the direct correspondence, and “should be understood as an expression of an intuitive idea that cannot yet be formulated in any other or better way” (70; vol. 15).

Here, the correlative structure of the archetype to the symbol is better understood as being limited though tangible, as Jung strives to describe in his example of Plato who “puts the whole problem of the theory of knowledge in his parable of the cave” (70; vol. 15) or of Christ who “expresses the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven in parables” (70; vol. 15). As has been discussed in minutiae thus far, the sign and symbol are different in that the symbols more opaque nature disallows a direct language to be used in conveyance, yet the symbol still is that which allows for meaning to be illuminated, but in an incidental manner that is contingent upon the whole for a totality to be comprehended. In short, “true symbols ... attempt to express something for which no verbal concept yet exists” (Jung 70; vol. 15). Archetype then is but a final symbol in that it is the accumulation of complementary elements in unison that perhaps have neither clear nor strict formalization to them but are of a coherent unit and may express an idea that is ultimately as loosely definable as it is mutable in its instance. As Jung notes in *Man and His*

Symbols, this exact intangibility of the symbol *vis-à-vis* archetype appears foremost in dreams, where “it appears not as a rational thought but as a symbolic image” (23) by which its interpretation or analysis reverts to that of the archetype of its origins, symbolizing both the instance of individualization and the archetype itself.

The symbol and archetype are therefore both dynamic in that they “convey living, subjective meaning” (Edinger 109) and “bear a subjective dynamism” (109). For this reason archetype and symbol can be equally regarded as “a living, organic entity” (Edinger 109). To wit, archetypes and symbols both pertain to comparative truth theory as they relate the essence of one to another as being equivocal. Signs bear no such nature as they carry the understanding they demonstrate within themselves and are not left open to further interpretation. “We can thus say a sign is dead, but a symbol is alive” (Edinger 109). Unlike a sign, the archetype acting as a symbol extends beyond the mere initial instance of it *per se*. Similarly, hidden in a multi-layered fashion from direct interpretation, to be dependent upon its subjective interjection amongst its context, is the archetype as it stands to be interpreted in literary cause.

2.4. Mythos as Methodology

While archetype may be relegated to but a single function of analysis in comparative literature in which the many may be folded into the one, this is not the true purpose of the archetype. The many instances of the actual item from which the archetype emerges in artistic quality are but germane to the respective archetype itself and are not conclusively determined in their final outcomes by the archetype proper. They serve as a gathering point of classification that sheds illumination on the item of their creation, but do not strictly define the essence or substance of one or the former. Archetype has hereby been shown to be a participatory phenomenon that can be utilized as a framework for analysis and interpretation. In support of this assertion, Frye goes so far as to state that this form allows further insight into all aesthetic mediums. For the written word, he was of the opinion that the linguistic qualities of speech were but one aspect while in the consideration of the literary wherein words, rhythms, and sequences of sounds form patterns at one boundary, which “approach the hieroglyphic or pictorial image at the other” (Frye, “The Archetypes of Literature” 508) in which the other total sense of the usage of words as one emerges. It is the intersection between these two of finding the usage of the

words and their ultimate interrelated imagery that forms as a series of symbols that the meaning of the narrative lays. Frye goes on to state that “the attempts to get as near to these boundaries as possible form the main body of what is called experimental writing” (“The Archetypes of Literature” 508). Stemming from this axis which Frye asserts, it can be readily seen how the archetype as form lends itself to a comprehensive analysis of the text, as it supplies the axioms from which the analysis may proceed in relation to literature as a whole, encompassing both the form of which it takes and the words/forms chosen to do so. When grasping the two *in toto*, Frye maintains that “we hear or listen to a narrative, but when we grasp a writer’s total pattern we ‘see’ what he means” (“The Archetypes of Literature” 508). In like approach, archetype is to be used within this paper as the means and method by which the literary is to be examined as according to mythos understanding.

Though the function of how the archetype may be detected in symbols has been thus elucidated, but the reasoning of how it is to be calculated has only been lightly touched upon thus far. On these same terms of the presentation of the ultimately inexpressible, a clarification of the logic to which the archetype may be defined also needs extrapolating. The antecedent to the logic gate of its implication or consequent to what an archetype is and therefore what it must mean in its literary context, at least as concerns the literary truth of its relation, is not one that is meant to be understood as mutually exclusive units of which if P therefore Q, or if X is Y, and Y is Z, then Z must be X.

Instead, it naturally follows that the dynamic nature of the archetype equally demands that preference be given to its understanding and interpretation to a more dynamic logic that neither is exclusive nor inclusive of a total logic gate, but one that tries to include a correlative response that aims to incorporate entire logical units and not singular instances to reach a conclusion, one in which P relates to Q, thereby both can be established as being P~Q, but not R, since $T \Rightarrow P$.

The terminology of this logic, as well as an explanation of its functions, shall be now explained as according to terms of *mythos* instead of a contingent *logos* reasoning as to impart the importance of the inclusive comprehensiveness of *mythos* as the logical means testing by which fiction may be analyzed.

Mythos as a methodological standard by which analysis may be approached is vital to that of utilizing the symbols of archetype as a means to literary analysis. Karen Armstrong in her

study, *A Short History of Myth*, pined it is to err to maintain that “only logical, rational discourse brings true understanding” (39). The nature of fiction or the imaginative is removed from the sheer logic of discourse as it functions along its own lines of reason taking form within the logic it pertains to within its own systems of logic and reality. The *mythos* of the narrative as is read aims to impart a significance in gained understanding that may not be rationally logical or critically explanative to a pertinent discourse of *logos* alone, instead it seeks to have the subject matter understood through the discourse itself as it is unfolded and is understood along non-purely rational lines, following the comprehension apprehended from the actual experience and not simply the divorced theory of it. The conclusion arrived at, through *mythos*, is one that is reached cumulatively which is examined from parts into the whole and not *vice versa*. This is not to argue, however, that the reasoning of logic has no place to grasp an absolute truth, it is simply secondary as the tool to interpret illustrative means. Armstrong also touches upon this particular point, claiming that

[t]he Ideas of Love, Beauty, Justice and the Good cannot be intuited or apprehended through the insights of myth or ritual, but only through the reasoning powers of the mind. ... From a scientific perspective, these myths are nonsense and a serious seeker after truth should ‘turn rather to those who reason by means of demonstration’. (39)

It is the nature of the symbols of the narrative and its inherent archetype that seek to explain these very innate but intangible concepts through the use of them and by which they should be accorded analysis as to their nature and form and not their abstraction through isolated units – the former is analysis through *mythos* while the latter is through *logos*.

Active logic that follows lines of reasoning based on signs in equation with one another to arrive at conclusions that may be tested tautologically is, naturally, easily provable but inevitably lacking. Signs, as singular units that have defined and limited objective meaning, need not incorporate themselves with other signs in an interdependent deception of logic; namely, *logos* relies on a congruent system of signs that maintain, at the very least, a tacit meaning in order for its tautological foundations to remain intact. Such a system of logic, though readily handy when needing to define and evidence one’s direct line of thought or reasoning, is crucial

in the defensive or persuasive processes and is not totally discluded from this work (after all, even this espousal is done logically). However, as *logos* fails to incorporate the outlying and is not constructed around the associative nature which may establish the symbol, which, as has been clarified, is of an abstruse and subjective meaning, using *logos* alone cannot be methodologically sound in the analysis of archetype “as the mind explores the symbol, it is led to ideas that lie beyond the grasp of reason” (Jung, *Man and his Symbols* 20-21). The alternative of *mythos* seeks to expand beyond the stringent barriers of *logos* by accounting for the subjective and incorporative the elusive meaning of symbols, as to include that which may not be directly inherent to a sign, but is nonetheless significant. As an archetype is symbolically inclusive and associatively created, analysis through *mythos* would therefore be the soundest approach to take when approaching literature through the prism of archetype. This is not to categorically disclude the use of *logos* from its incorporation into analysis as all rational means are founded upon it and it naturally behooves itself in usage. However, as opposed to *mythos*, “*logos* must correspond to facts; it is essentially practical; it is the mode of thought we use when we want to get something done” (Armstrong 46). Here the aim is to reveal literary truth, not merely to establish the direct and unalterable facts of the matter at hand.

As has been explained, the archetype is received in its symbolic context foremost; to be interpreted *post facto* to its reading after it has been internally understood. Such a sequence is counter to that of *Logos* which may be applied after the fact according to defined logical rules that may be imposed externally onto the text as to seek out the logic that, though not-necessarily incorporative of the text itself, still remains logically true. (To put this on other, more precise words, it is best to consider the difference between *mythos* as an encompassing logical system and *logos* as of a consistent logical system as that of whether it is of the spirit of the text or of the letter.) The symbolic meaning is inherently a value unto itself and since archetype bears no predetermined function beyond its usage *pro forma* and association as such emerges in the text, archetypes as understood through *mythos* are natural to understanding the narrative in its totality, as well as to the unique logic used within.

More to the point, as it is integral in the logic of any system, as it is presented, for its system to be taken as a given and from which the interpretation of the symbols used to be based upon, there need be distinct interpolation inside of the signs and symbols that comprise the data set provided. However, while *logos* is only reliable in the consistency of itself as a given group

of signs, *mythos* is more heavily reliable as a means to logical end that may be paired against the external.

As the text may be approached firstly from purely logical means, as in *logos*, confusion coincides as the symbology of the archetype seems remote or is disavowed in favor of direct logic of ready tautological proof. The text itself, in such logic, may therefore become a barrier to its own reading as the reader cannot engage it since the associated aspects of it in symbolic form, its *mythos*, is abandoned by the wayside. Armstrong supposes that such interpretation is the result of the exacting scientific discourse that has arisen in western culture that deactivates such symbology from understanding in favor of a language consisting solely of signs, tautologies, and equations. She states that were myth not inherently incorporated into modern Western culture, “many would lose all sense of what it was” (Armstrong 47). Indeed, in such regard to the lack of understanding of the mythic, it may often be the complaint of the reader or lay critic of any narrative that “this just makes no sense”. Such a criticism, though valid in its own right and certainly applicable on numerous occasion, is flawed in that it only takes the literal system of signs as is presented within the system and does not seek to explain the narrative either within its respective wider limits or assign a logical structure which fails to incorporate the actual logic behind the narrative. Claiming, for instance, that a work of science fiction is not realistic may be valid when approaching it from the standpoint of how accurate the science of the narrative may be, but is not a valid criticism against any literary merit the narrative may hold. This is not to imply or even so much as to suggest that a narrative be found logical on its own merits or even be given a free pass when held to close scrutiny, rather that the narrative be first judged upon how it seeks to describe to its reader the story and then after be subject to external logical norms that are to judge the validity and value of it as a narrative “work” instead of a logical system. Whereas *logos* is best to criticize the system *mythos* aims to criticize its essence and substance, the latter thereby being the choice of logic within the methodology of analysis as shall follow in this work.

From this very supposition of *mythos*, archetype by its nature should also not be taken purely by its logical ends alone, rather the archetype’s total correlative and dynamic associations thereof (i.e., the text as a whole), within its directly corresponding derived context. Such an opinion Jung has explicitly made clear, underlying the fact that the archetype “has a wider ‘unconscious’ aspect that is never precisely defined or fully explained,” (*Man and his Symbols*

20-21) whose vagueness entirely leaves it upon its mercy as it is revealed in its systematic context, not in the limits of pure and isolated logical means. Moreover, archetype, based upon the merits of the system in which it is given, also extends and shares in its interrelations with those similar or same but external to the text as they speak and aim towards similar goals, which may be regarded as true in a comparative context since their symbolic nature leads to similar corresponding ends. Owing to the fact that *logos* is only concerned with a system of congruency based upon isolated signs, it is at best weak at this process as it can only compare systems and not similarities. Rahe asserts how for Aristotle *logos* “makes it possible for him [human being] to perceive and make clear to others through reasoned discourse the difference between what is advantageous and what is harmful, between what is just and what is unjust, and between what is good and what is evil” (*Republics Ancient and Modern* 21).

Archetype as a means to analysis is liberating as it permits the examination of the text not merely within its own context in the form in which it is presented, but also in the enriching addition to the equally important cross-sectional manner that overcomes imposed limited narrative barriers as well as those which would otherwise restrict a narrative to itself as an isolated object. Therein, this “logic” of *mythos* must be applied when analysis is not clearly delineated within its own boundaries, whether these extend to all human thought, literature, or simply one instance in their literary usage, is the leveled interpretation undergone hereafter, but notwithstanding consideration.

Mythos as a logical means to analysis naturally then necessitates archetype as, according to Jung, it itself is a process that behaves as an “essentially ... mythological figure” (81; vol. 15). Archetype is free to take on the form of its own naturally cogent manifestation regardless of the underlying logic one may superimpose upon it externally, by which its logical ends might be difficult to isolate as well. The archetype is what it is and should be understood as such. It speaks to the *mythos* of understanding in allowing for a narrative to be interpreted based upon an intuitive mode of thought that would be otherwise discarded due to being “neglected in favor of the more pragmatic, logical spirit of scientific rationality” (Armstrong 47) which is not the aim of literary analysis *per se* that should not be claimed to be a natural science, but of one aspect of the imperfect and hard to quantify humanities. The core concept, as concerns its usage within this paper is that only through the acceptance of the mutable as stemming from an immutable source can the self-imposed restraints of *logos* be transcended and the actual essence of the

narrative, its archetypes, be recognized in practice as the essential core to which affixes the narrative's own individuation of meaning in its differing context; i.e., the narrative's *mythos*.

For this very reason of respecting the narrative, the critical nature of what it intends to convey within its choice of literary usage (word, element, allusion, archetype, and so on) must be approached holistically and not merely rely upon an individual basis or parts taken separately into a separate categorization in order for the literary to receive its due discourse. Literary analysis must be approached by examining corresponding parts within inherent contexts relative to them. In this sense, it is not so much the one-to-one direct logical conclusion that should be assumed when examining the archetype, rather how the story functions as a whole pertaining to its usage which can be put together as a system of symbology, understood on its own terms while incorporating the literary expanse of others. Here, *mythos* is understood as logic open to narrative discourse, not hindered by external logic.

Frye, when examining the reach of archetype in literature, provides myth (in the traditional sense of the word as the lore either religious or otherwise common to a group) as his starting point, stating that "we begin our study of archetypes ... with a world of myth, an abstract or purely literary world of fictional and thematic design" (*Anatomy of Criticism* 136). He selects myth in order to directly specify the nature of its literary symbolic association in which the dynamic associations of archetype may come to the surface as symbolic object and not be relegated to dismissal in the thematic whole as inter-dispersed units of nonsense. He highlights, as in the nature of *mythos*, the archetype emerging to form a logic of its own which is readily seen in *myth*.

To illustrate the point that the essence of a narrative is within its symbolic and dynamic association of its corresponding motif and archetypes of which it is subject to, one need go no further than comparative religious concepts as to ascertain the importance behind logic of *mythos*. When an examination of myth on a global basis is undertaken, many scholars both ancient and modern have commented on the similitudes affecting the nature of individual mythic narratives. Herodotus himself, the founder of history for the sake of narrative, claimed that the Egyptian and Greek Gods were but one, not upon sacrosanct grounds, but stemming from the natural common foundation upon which their respective verbal narratives were heard and religious natures observed, to their correlation in their naturally singular correspondence which he ultimately supposed. In book two of his *Histories*, Herodotus goes so far as to state that the

nature of the ancient pantheon of “gods” were one in the same, having common origination, but, in their worship, coming to manifest themselves in their own disparate manner:

What they [the Egyptians] told me concerning their religion it is not my intention to repeat, except the names of their deities, which I believe all men know equally. ... The Egyptians ... first brought into use the names of the twelve gods, which the Greeks adopted from them; and first erected altars, images, and temples to the gods; and also first engraved upon stone the figures of animals. (n.pag.)

Though not in the actual words, Herodotus here originally accords the mythic understanding of the archetype as it is formed within specific context to the mythic understanding as based upon the individual instance of its manifestation, by which it is to be understood in its total context.

Joseph Campbell, foremost expert on the nature of myth in the modern age and whom we shall return to later, in his study, *The Mask of God*, reflects upon the same germ of common religious background as adapting to individual forces of indigenous cultures – much in the same individuation of archetype as has been laid out thus far – wherein he states on myth:

[i]n every well-established culture realm to which a new system of thought and civilization comes, it is received creatively, not inertly. A sensitive, complex process of selection, adaptation, and development brings the new forms into contact with their approximate analogues or homologues in the native inheritance, and in certain instances - notably in Egypt, Crete, the Indus valley, and a little later, the Far East - prodigious forces of indigenous productivity are released in native *style*, but on the level of the new *stage*. In other words, although its culture stage at any given period may be shown to have been derived, as an effect of alien influences, the particular style of each of the great domains can no less surely be shown to be indigenous. (48)

Only one further step removed from this argumentation allows for the same form of archetype as to be applied to the literary wherein the specific or “indigenous” nature of the manifestation itself is that which receives analysis as well as the spirit from which it arises. Yet,

it is done within the context of its systemic *mythos* structure, allowing for individual units of archetype to shine through and systems be compared by tracking similarities in origin and common meaning of association between symbols in narrative as throughout.

Though not directly addressing these same open concepts of archetype, Karen Armstrong has offered her own criticism as approaching the meaning and modern interpretation of religious myth (or narratives of any sort for that matter) through pure *logos* alone, by which she appeals to the essence of understanding religion inherently through its essential symbolic means and not its literal dogmatic nature. Of note is that she contends that one of the reasons as to why religious myth has both become more controversial and less relevant is that it is approached by purely logical means which inveigh upon the reader (the participant of the narrative) to appreciate merely the argument that is substantiated after the fact as given as designated or assigned. This is not the actual essence or meaning of the text but justification of a logical argument, cited as proof of such. In the various frameworks of interpretation, logic alone distances the myth from the reader, hence also distances the *mythos* or narrative interpretation that is to be had from reading the text itself, as has been discussed as being through an understanding and connection of direct access to archetypes.

Armstrong distinguishes between interpretation of logic and that of narrative, specifically pointing out that when it comes to myth; it “requires either emotional participation or some kind of ritual mimesis to make any sense at all” (38). A purely logical approach of *logos* secures neither. Such an approach of *mythos* also involves the direct participation of the reader whereas a mere superficial and logical interpretation of pure reason or *logos* “tries to establish the truth by means of careful inquiry in a way that appeals only to the critical intelligence” (Armstrong 38), thereby, leaving out the import of examining the narrative on a holistic ground of interpretation.

This relates directly to Jung’s recognition of the archetype seeing that he also qualified immediate access through participation done symbolically as an interpretive based understanding of the individual of the outside whole as according to the archetype, by means of which a free avenue to the essence of the object is to be achieved. If anything else, Jung was adamant that the *archetype* is but a form through which essence is to emerge and be more readily apparent through an abstract understanding of the primordial images affecting the human psyche, in each of which “there is a little piece of human psychology and human fate, a remnant of the joys and sorrows that have been repeated countless times in our ancestral history, and on the average

follow ever the same course” (81; vol. 15). Appealing to the nature of a thing instead of coherent signature systems, archetype may be said to offer a ready path through its symbolization, as has thus been discussed – in particular to its relation with natural, human association that lies outside the realm of mere logic.

In their literary application, archetypes are also of benefit to addressing the base logic of human epistemic insight, inherent to comprehension based upon human psychological reasoning. Approaching the text through the lens of *mythos* permits a layer beyond the mere quantifiably logical to emerge. The mythic or the implicit narrative structures arrived at through archetype engage the participant of the narrative on a level that speaks to the reader’s intuition, not their logic alone.

Archetypes stand behind the mythical (fictional) aspect of the narrative that may be lost upon a reader engaged on a purely logical account of the words set out to him or her by engaging the patterns and forms inherent to the function of the narrative by which the reader, at its core, comprehends its substantive form. Jung tried to justify this assertion by noting that “the moment when this mythological situation reappears is always characterized by a peculiar emotional intensity [i.e., in the reader]; it is as though chords in us were struck that had never rescinded before, or as though forces whose existence we never suspected were unloosed” (81; vol. 15). It is from this same basis that the concepts of *monomyth* emerge in regards to the fact that this mythos of logic can approach the participant of the story in only the manner of which the human psyche is represented through myth and narrative, unable to diverge from its forms. As Armstrong has noted, when commenting on the singular nature of the use of storytelling in human societies, “there is nothing new in the godless mythologies of contemporary novels, which grapple with many of the same intractable and elusive problems of the human condition as the ancient myths” (53). It is clear then that *mythos*, though its own species of semi-undefinable logic, is sensible and limited by its own means, as can be seen by the nature of narrative it must obey and that any violation of the mythic inspires credulence from the part of the reader or viewer.

Archetypes in literary analysis therefore serve a further function as allowing for an extension of analysis, a separate language used to unravel and decode narrative structures. This is not to suggest, however, that the modern novel aims to replace myth, it is but myth in modern form, or that even the myths of old are the basis for all narratives henceforth – these are all

arguments not in the purview of this exploration – rather that a concept of *mythos* relying on the symbol of archetypes may seek to better act as a language of interpretation itself when exploring narrative forms. Given its nature of appealing to archetypes that stand as a reference point both within and outside the text, the interpretative language of *mythos* should also permit a more comprehensive overview of collective archetypes that incorporates literary allusion through direct and indirect means. Archetype, by the nature multi-formed from manifold works, is shared across the cornucopia of literature and can be but another element in the amelioration of novel forms of literary analysis to the seemingly illogicality of narratives through its usage of references that may be extant to the text itself but known to the reader. The literary narrative therein as seen through the spectrum of applied literary analysis follows the archetype as it appears and manifests from within the narrative as symbols but not being excluded from distinct symbology of which the text may allude to from without as a total system of a language of symbols that encompasses an inward and outward stance as understood through the methodological view of *mythos*.

It might be surmised that narratives that incorporate mythic aspects are challenging to the modern mindset due to the fact that we are still weaned on axioms of logic that fail to comprehend the particular or uniqueness of the fictive as it establishes a story which seeks to explain and illustrate, rather than be a floridly descriptive tautology seeking *to prove*. After all, as Armstrong has noted when reflecting on the culture of the last several centuries, “by the end of the nineteenth century, the severance of logos and mythos seemed complete” (50). However, the disengagement of fiction as being everything except a fictionalized story to entertain is true only in some popular attitudes and Armstrong takes a strong stance against story for merely the sake of its narrative when she states that “[W]e must disabuse ourselves of the nineteenth-century fallacy that myth is false or that it represents an inferior mode of thought” (51). Indeed, the narrative is itself its own logical structure that belongs to archetypal motif upon which its own meaning is to be found through reflective analysis. Just as Jung encapsulates the nature of human storytelling into myth making through archetypes, Armstrong underscores the fact that humans “are myth-making creatures” (51) by which archetype comes to be manifest as a merely the method through which the expression of narrative as a paradigm is born in deed and in product.

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

Archetype as pertains to modern literature has grown in prominence, particularly within the last century. This has arisen from an overt attempt to superimpose a richness associated in the archetype found in traditional myth (or at the very least, in the theories thereof) onto the modern predisposed logical world. The use of overlay of one narrative or the allusion to archetypal structures is well established. Armstrong claims that modern novelists and poets have tried to better incorporate *mythos* as a way to counteract an overextension of logic within the modern age “to explore the modern dilemma. We need think only of James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, published in the same year as *The Waste Land*, in which the experience of Joyce’s contemporary protagonists corresponds to episodes in Homer’s *Odyssey*” (53). Perhaps this is but another reason why the archetype heavy world of not only Joycean literature but the entire post-modern spectrum has proven a challenge to literary analysis and to the reader, as it could be readily seen as a provocative attempt to harmonize the *mythos* of the text(s) through the distinct interpolation in the archetypes they share. It may not seem even apparent at first glance that this is the vantage point one should take upon examination of such works, laden in the difficulty of multiple allusions. Yet, it would be even more of a challenge to approach them purely on logical grounds through the mere quantifiable abstraction of the utilized words or their instance in use.

As the unique purview of archetype into literary analysis has been established, it can now be hereafter regarded that it is upon the prerogative of the literary analyst to make the unseen seen, to bring to light that which is otherwise obscured and to draw from it, as if from a very deep well, the symbols that lead to coherent and correspondent conclusions as to arrive at the tenets of literary truth found within the examined work as according to the macro framework of narrative archetype as a means to direct literary analysis.

The objective now is to best demonstrate how Jungian archetype functions in practice through the deconstruction of a text rich in example of its utilization, thereby noting how a narrative can be read in multivariate form that delves from the direct meaning of its language of symbols into an indirect form of its associated semiological meaning. Such analysis through the use of archetype and as according to a methodology outlined of *mythos*, significantly contributes to the reading and analysis of the text.

2.5. Archetypes as Literary Criticism

It behooves us to reiterate now that archetype is not an exclusionary device used in analysis to relegate the entirety of literature into a compendium assigned by chapter as according to archetype category which is to thereby render further analysis to literature as invalid if falling outside these terms, rather it an associative structure in which to add to the discourse of literary merit that is sought, one in which complex works may be better overcome in their analyses, as to disentangle the core elements and bring them to better light.

The use of archetypal characters, settings, themes and other elements of a text in a form of “collectives representations”, gives to a literary work a universal acceptance, since the reader is one who identifies these repetitive patterns in his or her own social, historical and cultural framework. By employing common archetypal ideas, whether in the writing or analysis of a single literary work, the writer/reader (literary critic) can relate to these situations and characters as they are drawn from the experiences of the world. Therefore, the story is already told and the conclusion may already be derived in a number of instances. The hero slays the dragon and is corrupted by the power of its blood. The witch is burdened in the oven and the children are saved. Against all odds, the group returns home. The young hero overcomes all obstacles to emerge as an adult. Whatever the plot or motif may be, the story is somehow familiar. Through the exploration of the use of Jungian archetype, which itself is defined by the universal human experience (i.e., the collective unconscious), this shall be brought better to light.

Starting from the basic assumption that every literary work grows out from the pre-structured archetype, this manner of a literary method called archetypal criticism, also considers that archetypes define the form and function of one work. In this view, the whole literature relies on a certain number of elementary performances, characters and other conventional elements which are constantly repeated throughout literary history, and for which it is assumed that they stand for essential mythical aspects of human experience. To clarify this complexity, a work may call itself its own at all times, where it maintains its unique form as being *qua* itself, but may never be delivered as purely original, as having been derived externally to that which has created it. This is also a basis upon which Jungian archetypes analyze a text, particularly Joyce.

It has thus been established that the archetype is to be examined as a dual key through whose use the narrative is to be analyzed and clarified. As has also been stated in the

*UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT THROUGH JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES
AS APPLIED TO LITERARY CRITICISM*

introduction, the works of James Joyce are to be subject to the analytical means which have thus been laid out in their theory. It is now then important to establish the reason as to why Joyce is an apt selection among literary figure whose use of archetypes⁷ deserves analysis, which will be enlightened particularly through the discussion of his works in the following chapters.

⁷ “Not long after Parnell’s death ... the nine-year-old James Joyce, feeling as angry as his father, wrote a poem denouncing Healy under the title ‘Et Tu, Healy’. ... [t]he poem, in equating Healy and Brutus, was Joyce’s first use of an antique prototype for a modern instance, Parnell being Caesar here” (Ellmann, *JJ* 33).

3. *Dubliners*: A Book of Despair through the Portrayal of Paralysis, Gnomon, and Simony

3.1. *The Reader Comprehends*

In their reading, the stories that comprise the work of *Dubliners* are salient in their lack of traditional narrative structures. Commonly, it may be expected from a narrative that a protagonist, generally likeable to the reader, undergoes trials and tribulations that lead to the transformation of the protagonist in spite of the machinations of the antagonist or antagonisms, culminating in a revelatory conclusion. *Dubliners* has no such structure and is, instead, replaced with a series of events and protagonists who seem to either give into their antagonisms or even fail to see them. Yet, the stories do include conclusions that are demonstrative, even poignant, as concerns the plot to which the protagonists undergo, but it is only to the reader who is participatory to the effect and not presented forthwith in the text themselves. Such a role in the text the reader must have. He or she must read the text as the outsider looking into a window which reveals the actual conclusion. If not actively and closely read, the meaning of the gnostic revelation will be lost since it occurs outside of the page, only within the reader's understanding of the text. The reader is the one who knows what the standard, "dime-store" ending should be, but which is not presented. The reader may also project the actions not taken by the protagonist which do not lead to these same conclusions but follow the protagonists as shadows.

Margot Norris, in her study *Suspicious Readings of James Joyce's Dubliners*, is of this very same opinion stating how

[i]t is as important to attend to everything that is outside the narration – outside it in a determinate sense – and to treat these extra-narrational elements as expressive and, therefore, as silent discourse that supplement, interrogate, and frequently, dispute the narration. ... Sometimes the silent discourse is no more than the pressure of a rhetoric that invites us to consider its obverse, to wonder if the story couldn't be otherwise, or at least be told in another way. (9)

It could be argued then that Joyce is not merely inviting the reader to read between the lines but insisting on attending to that which is left unsaid but is also apparent in its direct omission.

The purpose of the texts, however, is forthwith upon examination: examinations in paralysis.

3.1.1. A Paralytic Text

The stories of *Dubliners* return specifically to an exact archetypal motif from which the plots of their individual narratives share though do not necessarily match one for one. Separately, they may be seen as the individuation of the same motif in its repeated form, to the extent of which these stories all are case studies of a certain dislocation that overtakes their characters as one complete narrative following the motif of *paralysis*. Interspersed within these stories are differing archetypal events that explore, again, individuated instances of the *paralysis* as they affect them. Moreover, the *paralysis* motif is borne out through a series of archetypal figures, which may themselves be repeated in varying manner and method from story to story. Further to the point, the paralysis is not spelled out entirely to the reader, but it is left to the reader's own devices as to come to, which is hereto labeled, in Joyce's own usage, as the *gnomon*.

However, in spite of this firm foundation of *paralysis* and despite the machinations of the literati who have brushed aside *Dubliners* as merely being best explained by the term, the aim should not be to simply analyze *Dubliners* through *paralysis* alone, rather as this term is to be understood in its context from the text(s), as it is not enough to state that the stories are only examinations of "paralysis" in and of themselves. They are of a particular view of the "paralysis" of the character, in defined circumstances of plot and setting, i.e., stories, that delve into the torpor of the differing manners that such "paralysis" befalls them, but doing so as to not take away or directly criticize but to offer a picture encompassing a whole. This archetype of the paralyzed character or the motif of the character undergoing a state of supposed or so-termed paralysis is, to reiterate, the *gnomon* by which all points intersect to achieve their whole, both individually and as a collected work.

A priori is that at the opening of "The Sisters", the first story to make up the collection, Joyce cites *paralysis* specifically as a word behooving the importance of reflection, not merely

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

from the death of the character of the priest, who had succumbed to a type of *paralysis* and is the subject of the story proper, but as a word that the unnamed narrator cites as one in an order of increasing perplexity: “Every night as I gazed up at the window I said softly to myself the word paralysis. It had always sounded strangely in my ears, like the word *gnomon* in the Euclid and the word *simony* in the Catechism” (*D* 1).

The manner in which paralysis comes to be unveiled within the story is anything but accidental – it is singled out throughout as warranting special attention. *Paralysis* as to the observation of the death of the priest, whose passing had just occurred, becomes also commentary and receives its own separate attention as a unique section unto itself – clearly intentional by the author as distinct in narrative significance. As the narrator is one that examines the events retrospectively, through the supposed eyes of a child but in the voice of an adult, the narrative is divided between two distinct sections: one which details the main narrator’s reflection on the events and the other a detailed conversation between the narrator’s aunt and the caretaker (boy’s aunt). The first section, or introduction of term, highlights the notion of paralysis through its further definition, while the second lends insight into the actual death of the priest, offering more detail without resolution (this latter part being the *gnomon*) as to what paralysis actually is in terms of *Dubliners*.

It should here be noted in further evidence of its import that Joyce had originally not included the interlude in the original version of the story. This was later added when a compendium was assembled of all stories together as to be published as one collection. According to Florence Walzl’s 1973 *James Joyce Quarterly* essay, where she examines Joyce’s draft of the first story of *Dubliners* – “The Sisters”, the words *paralysis*, *gnomon* and *simony* were later additions. They were presumably added to serve as an opening and prelude to the collection of his short stories.⁸ To wit, due to their later inclusion, it may be easily surmised that these words were specifically added as an intro to assemble the narratives into one overlying structure that would account for each individually as part of the whole. They are cited as not clues, but guide words to which the rest of the stories are to be understood, in which they will have their own instances of all three (*paralysis*, *gnomon* and *simony*).

⁸ Walzl concludes how “[E]xamination of the final versions indicates that ‘The Sisters’ had been gradually redesigned to act as introduction and overture to the volume as a whole” (Walzl 376). For more on this subject see Walzl, “Joyce’s ‘The Sisters’: a Development”, pp. 375-421.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Paralysis, which only receives two mentions, is best understood from its second appearance:

In the dark of my room I imagined that I saw again the heavy grey face of the paralytic. I drew the blankets over my head and tried to think of Christmas. But the grey face still followed me. It murmured; and I understood that it desired to confess something. I felt my soul receding into some pleasant and vicious region; and there again I found it waiting for me. It began to confess to me in a murmuring voice and I wondered why it smiled continually and why the lips were so moist with spittle. But then I remembered that it had died of *paralysis*. (*D* 2; emphasis added)

According to this passage, paralysis may be read as pertaining or akin to the Jungian archetype of the shadow, wherein “the shadow personifies everything that the subject refuses to acknowledge about himself and yet is always thrusting itself upon him directly or indirectly” (Jung 284; vol. 9, pt. 1). The shadow is an active archetype that remains in conflict to the ego in that the latter refuses recognition of the former, all the while perfectly aware of being followed, as if it were a spectre, it lies outside the realm of direct communication. In more basic words, the shadow haunts the individual’s ego yet still bears influence over one’s actions. The shadow serves merely to intimate the semi-aware problematic details of one’s existence, while the ego actuates itself based on recognition of itself.

This *paralysis* as proffered by Joyce is tantamount in character as that of the Jungian shadow, a spectre haunting an ego, influencing it, underlying it, following it, yet not necessarily being the character itself but the depth and meaning of their motivations. Given the nature of the priest’s apparition, *paralysis* may be defined thusly within Joyce as the powerlessness in the face of the shadow, or as Burgess has noted when interpreting other charters in their respective powerlessness, “in the presence of a terrible ultimate truth” (*ReJoyce* 52). Here, the character of the narrator tormented by the spirit of the recently departed priest is the dyad of the shadow and ego. As if in the act of imminent confession, the words are not elicited and reconciliation of the two together fails to pass. Ultimately, when the narrator is further confused as to why the priest cannot merely tell him, he is reminded that it is impossible, as he is *paralytic* and unable to

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

speak. In the Jungian sense of the Shadow, which serves not to reveal but to haunt, the priest extends nothing to the narrator; rather, it serves only to accompany it, besetting the ego with issues that still yet underpin consciousness. This can be seen metaphorically in that the narrator does not realize why the priest cannot speak in the literal sense. The rectification of that information or knowledge held hidden through the veil of the shadow by the priest, which needs to come to light and receive an actualization through internalization as to come to pass, cannot be understood by the boy nor can the Priest tell it.

Paralysis in *Dubliners*, therefore, should be defined as a lack of self-realization upon its main characters, to whom events in the plot transpire but are not fully confronted with or understood by the character themselves, or, even if a revelation of sorts occurs, is not actualized upon by the same characters, and hence, returns to a paralytic form of a *shadow*. It is the inability to understand oneself better or have the inner torment of oneself understood and mastered to an extent that a character may develop from it. The *Dubliners* subject to Joyce's work are in a cycle of non-traditional character development, in which progress eludes them. Disparate in reflection, each story features a character propelled through a lackluster, desperate, or disappointing precarious existence that mirrors a compulsion onwards by whose events the characters find themselves ostensibly encumbered or entrapped by. The characters of *Dubliners* are helpless to act, caught in an existence of their own making, frequently lost in their thoughts. This is not to suggest that the lack of inertia does not take away from the rich humanity and experience the characters portend, simply presents it within its own light.

Here then it is established as to what is understood firmly by the mere definition of Joycean *paralysis* and which shall be discussed in detail within the following pages.

Given that the stories of *Dubliners*, though character driven, do not concern themselves with the presentation of the setting to propel the story onward but simply act as the backdrop to which the characters may interact with each other and the reader, it may be questioned as to why these short stories prove so readily readable if the plot excludes the characters from change, or even, in some stories, actual series of events that constitute plot. Indeed, each of *Dubliners'* narratives features one main protagonist who finds himself or herself in a situation that seems either inescapable or goes so far as to challenge the protagonists against themselves, seemingly devoid of resolution. In this sense, paralysis is the archetypal motif by which the stories of *Dubliners* unfold. It is the essence of paralysis as presented through example that Joyce returns

to in each story, in which there is a setup of an event in which a character takes part, in which the reader is given privy to an examination of the unique otherness of the character as they are paralyzed, and in which no resolution. Joyce does so, as Burgess has suggested, “to exhibit the syndrome of soul-rot” (*ReJoyce* 47).

3.1.2. *Gnomon: The Archetypal Shadow*

Nevertheless, it need be noted that the reader remains a third party to the events, outside the fourth wall, who can see through the paralysis and, as Joyce has written these stories, to understand *the shadow as paralysis*. The reader, as independent observer, knows of the issues that the character study of each story paints, even when the characters alone are written to not acknowledge the paralysis that overtakes them. In narrative terms, paralysis can here be noted as being anti-climatic or lacking closure in its nature as per the plot in whose events the characters find themselves passively involved. While this notion will be taken up later in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*, in which characters progress through a developmental cycle, it is in *Dubliners* that the lack of progression, the *paralysis* as it were, is the plot structure itself. The reader in relation to the text is omniscient, as it were, at least as to the world provided within the story, which allows them to see the extension of the *paralysis* which is also termed by Joyce as the *gnomon* representing the stylistic form of the textual symptoms of its narrative.

Joyce utilizes this particular word, uncharacteristically non-Irish neither English, which does not reappear in his other works, let alone in *Dubliners*. The definition of *gnomon* itself, in its stricter geometric usage, is “‘model, criterion, standard.’ It is also the name of the T-square by which one measures the accuracy of a right angle” (Albert 355). However, and more to the point, as Euclid has defined in his *Elements*, “in any parallelogrammic area let any one whatever of the parallelograms about its diameter with the two complements be called a gnomon” (50; bk. 2). A gnomon as in geometry would then mean the point to which complementary lines can be extended in order to complete a parallelogram, based upon given lines, angles, and points, as reflected in complementary angles from one another. To illustrate, such is also the shape a sundial or solar clock forms in which the shadow of the hand on the dial creates a triangle if a line extended from the end of the shadow to the hand of the sundial. The gnomon itself refers to the creation of an unreal figure or form based upon charted points, as they form not a triangle of

singular nature, but a parallelogram. The triangle of the sundial is but an assembly of points of what is lacking, which corresponds to the lines given. On a sundial this would be the light denied and transformed into shadow – merely coincidental to *the shadow* as archetype, but exacting in the illustration undertaken here to note what is present but not realized – from the first line of the hand. While, the shape somehow cannot be completed due to an inability to make a perfect extension of the shape, there is yet a perfect form that corresponds to all points and lines. Due to its temporary and corporeal nature, actual, perfect completeness always remains illusory and beyond the grasp of the shape to be completed. Moreover, as to further the example, the gnomon of the sundial should make a perfect parallelogram when the shadow is struck by a figured sundial (a triangle for instance), but as it is subject to the variances of light, no perfect reflection of the form is cast. To clarify, the *gnomon* exists merely within the thought of the perfect yet imperfect geometric nature of forms.

To Joyce, *gnomon* bears this very same meaning, in which the direct interpretive concept of the gnomon as used in Joyce reportedly underlines the fact that various events emerge in concert within the stories that create a form which can only be charted when all points are set in comparison to one another, but are not directly evident or given. The issue at hand is that not all points are perfectly set out in the story proper, but are inherently shown to the reader, demanding that the reader undertake a discourse with the text as to recognize the correlating extension to them as to arrive at a conclusion. Norris states the reader specifically inter-relate to the points of the *gnomon* that are unseen as reading *Dubliners* demands “a dynamic discursive field in which what is not spoken or said nonetheless ‘speaks’ in the story, in the sense that a speculative reconstruction of the gap or silence can be recreated. But it is always important to ask *why* the gap is there in the first place” (*Suspicious Readings* 10). Frequently the answer to the question as to *why* is that of mending the gap by means of application of demonstration of a *shadow* nature in which paralysis comes to the fore. Often the shadow is left out as the gnomon but it is to the understanding of the reading when discoursing with the text.

The archetype of the shadow as *paralysis* is but the reflection of the form that makes the *gnomon*, wherein the given points visible complement to the *shadow* itself. As the shadow of a sundial can directly make a form based upon the points within the points of a dial, so can the gnomon cast itself over the stories of *Dubliners* and it itself is supposedly the meaning of the story as it allows them to take shape. Yet, no perfect form takes shape, inasmuch as one segment

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

is always non-present to complete the form. More briefly put, the *gnomon* is the extension to which the *shadow* of *paralysis* extends within the complementary form of the reader's mind. Here then is both as to why Joyce has highlighted specifically these two words, as to paint a specific hue by which the stories are to be colored, and as to how he intends to structure them, given the lack of development within the confines singularly of character and plot.

Norris, along with others of Joyce's critics, considers that

Joyce made the figure and the function of the gap, the silence, and the figure of incompleteness an inescapable foregrounded trope in the story. By doing so he guaranteed that it could not be missed, and would therefore serve as a clew and a clue, a guiding thread and key to the entire volume's hermeneutical enigma. (*Suspicious Readings* 16)

This *gnomon* fits the same motif of the transparent and unique that can otherwise be seen, yet is left unclear that casts itself over the stories of *Dubliners*. However, in relation to the *shadow* of *paralysis*, it is here argued that the archetypal motif to be found is that of a pure lack of character development or progression that originates from a base source and casts itself upon the execution of the narrative structure, warping it as the *gnomon's* shadow is cast over it, influencing, affecting, or even establishing its identity. It is this metaphorical and literal archetype of the shadow that limits the base interpretation of the story to be based upon the word *paralysis*. In essence, this *gnomon* is another word for the same archetype of the shadow, the source akin to the master archetype of which the exemplary is shown through individual instances. The *gnomon* of *Dubliners* in practice as the text can be read is that of a paralysis that overshadows each narrative in congruence of its whole.

"The Dead", as the conclusion to the collection, offers an explanation as to the nature of paralysis that accounts for the same seen throughout the work as a whole. In the story, a certain anecdote is mentioned about an Uncle Billy and his horse who could go nowhere:

[t]he old gentleman had a horse by the name of Johnny. And Johnny used to work in the old gentleman's mill, walking round and round in order to drive the mill. That was all very well; but now comes the tragic part about Johnny. One fine day

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

the old gentleman thought he'd like to drive out with the quality to a military review in the park ... Out from the mansion of his forefathers ... he drove with Johnny. And everything went on beautifully until Johnny came in sight of King Billy's statue: and whether he fell in love with the horse King Billy sits on or whether he thought he was back again in the mill, anyhow he began to walk round the statue. (*D* 141-2)

The direct parallel is obvious in that the anecdote used within "The Dead" is to reflect upon the actual paralysis which is happening to the main characters within the narratives, but cannot escape from. However, the nuances thereof are not so immediately noticeable. The horse in question is suggested to have either fallen in love with the statue, which is a common occurrence within the other works of *Dubliners* in which the protagonist has a conflict in the motif of a love story, romance or self-love, or that the horse has done it out of habit based upon its life working in a mill, hence not knowing of anything else. In either case, the horse is unable to progress or even to recognize that the statue, of which it would have "fallen in love" is unreal, and that it is actually been freed from its otherwise daily drudgery. This continual return to the starting point of action for the protagonist is that which function as a *paralysis* in the narrative proper, in which the character experiences a denouement but no resolution.

As to further evidence this fact, Gabriel, the protagonist within the story, who has continually been circling around in his own thoughts in an attempt to come up with a speech to challenge the party guests but ultimately decides out of his own warmhearted nature to give a platitude as to not offend and thereby not achieving his original intent, entertains his audience upon completion of the anecdote, where he "paced in a circle round the hall in his goloshes amid the laughter of the others" (*D* 141-2). Not only here does the author provide insight into the nature of *paralysis* but also that the characters may be presented within a light of which it is acknowledged but not in a revelatory manner by the self. More crucially though, as concerns what is the nature of *paralysis* as presented, is the inability to move onward, to progress, and to find oneself back at the point of which one had departed.

To return Gabriel of "The Dead" his imitation of the horse is a reflection upon his inability to change the customs of which he has grown familiar with. It is interesting to note that throughout the story, as a framing device, Gabriel continually comes back to the idea that he

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

should flee his company of the Annunciation Day party and head out towards the Wellington monument, romanticizing the idea that those around it are somehow freer than himself. This serious consideration mirrors the mockery that Gabriel relates to his fellows with the anecdote of the horse, in which he is drawn to his statue, but he does not acknowledge his inability to do so, despite his best wishes and dreams. It is through to the reader of which this cleft between desire and inability become apparent.

The reader is the observer that may view the unseen form of the *gnomon* in its totality from a standpoint removed from the narrative yet still be participant to it. Due to the integral role the text bears in creating a narration from the reader, “it is never we who read *Dubliners* as much as it is *Dubliners* that reads us” (Norris, *Suspicious Readings* 15). As the text insists upon an active interpretation, the reader is drawn into it, acting vigilant and the ultimate narrator to the events of plot and character as they unfold. The reader is allowed to have an experience of insight or epiphany of “integritas, consonantia and claritas (which is *quidditas*)” (see Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 25-27) into the narrative as it unfolds, even though this privilege is not extended to the cast of characters of *Dubliners*, who are paralyzed and cannot seemingly reach a resolution that transforms them through self-revelation or realization. The reader, spared of the paralysis which is ever present in each story and paints character and narrative with a broad brush, acts as the progenitor of understanding into the work in which paralysis is seen though yet unseen by direct means except by few overt mentions. The stories themselves lack nothing in (claritas) *radiance* and it is the reader of them who unlocks their self-evidential nature. In other words, the reader casts light on the shadow archetype to make the *gnomon* visible. This does not necessarily mean the riddle is solved in completion, but the meaning is understood. This extension to the development of characters is termed as *the gnomon*.

Therein, though it be by a different term, this is the same essence of the literary archetype in analysis as has thus far been established as the terms of analysis for archetype within Joyce’s works. Though the forms by which *paralysis* emerge and the stages by which it overtakes the various assortments of characters be heterogeneous throughout, they can be taken individually as congruent case studies in paralysis.

3.1.3. The Profanity of Simony

It behooves analysis to not exclude the final, remaining word the narrator reflects upon of *simony*, a word which is ascribed to the catechism of the church, but whose origins are from the story of the magician sorcerer Simon Magus as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles:

When Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, 'Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.' But Peter said unto him, 'Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee, for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.' Then answered Simon, and said, 'Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things which ye have spoken come upon me'. (8:12–24)

Simon as a character in these verses reflects an archetypal motif found in literature in which the profane, meaning that which is found to be in the mundane or flesh of the actual world, may transcend and become the sacred or spiritual. The *sacred* and the *profane* are treated in this respect as polar opposites whose existence negates one another. Furthermore, while the sacred may be reflected in the mundane as if in a reflection, the twain never establish contact, saving for in the concept of the spiritual which may, through grace, achieve such aims as to elevate the mundane, yet never reaching the actual sacred. This concept is duly seen within the parable: though Simon may offer money as but means to acquire the sacred powers of which the apostles possess, the transmission of the sacred does not follow such a path as based upon being acquired other than through the grace of god. Rather, the apostles chastise Simon, claiming that his heart, to use the modern parlance, "is in the wrong place," resulting in his inability to "receive the holy spirit". To this rebuke, Simon implores that they pray for him as to not let such things pass.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Though addressing religious definitions but notwithstanding the scope of the religious overtones of simony, Mircea Eliade provides that “the *sacred* and the *profane* are two modes of being in the world” (*The Sacred and the Profane* 14). He also notes that these same are in opposition to one another and mutually define themselves respectively as being polar opposites. As has been represented in the parable of Simon Magus, though the Holy Spirit is obtainable it is not an object that may be obtained directly but is merely transferred hence cannot be obtained (likely in reference to the self-revelation in the acceptance of Jesus as Christ as the only means to do so). However, as it is illogically sound to merely define an object by itself or opposite, it should be further explained that the sacred is that which can be seen as archetypal, as that which exists a priori to the actual item itself, as has been thus defined according to Jung. Eliade also comments that since it is divorced from the actuality reality of an item that “the sacred is a power” (*The Sacred and the Profane* 12). The profane, however, may take any form it likes, but only in accordance to a dim allusion to the sacred, as such as with archetype. Therein, no matter how much the profane seek to imitate the sacred, it cannot, and the sacred is unable to become the profane as it exists as an ideal on its own. This dichotomy again refers to the Jungian discourse of archetype and individuation, in which Eliade also notes the actualization in the dichotomy may happen only through its manifestation: “man becomes aware of the sacred because it manifests itself, shows itself as something wholly different from the profane” (*The Sacred and the Profane* 11). Therefore, religiously, the act of *simony* is to seek the violation of the profane through means which cannot manifest it due to its secondary, none *sacred* nature. Such a definition is herein applicable as that of being the idea of *simony* as referred to directly in “The Sisters”, as referred to in catechism.

However much this serves to illustrate, this is all as maybe unless it clarifies the finer point of the meaning of *simony* as is utilized within *Dubliners*. Joyce, in conjunction with *paralysis* and *gnomon*, was clearly striving to denote yet another aspect that the stories should be examined through. Following the religious definition of the term, it may be supposed then that Joyce meant by *simony* the attempting to attain that which lies sacred outside the body, a spiritual or intellectual attainment that results in revelation/manifestation, but through means that are profane which disallow for or incapacitate the character from doing so. This exact view, though in not the same wording, is supported by Blake Hobby who states that “Joyce creates a cohesive portrait of urbanities following vain desires, *Dubliners* for whom alienation is a shared

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

condition” (“Alienation in James Joyce’s *Dubliners*” 68). Albeit, here means alienation from one another as well as the total structure of society in which the setting of *Dubliners* is placed, this still marks the characters’ *paralysis* to achieve change as they fail to understand or reach a climax in revelation which would lead to a catharsis or a resolution in conflict. The actual means of which they fail is the *simony* through a confusion of the *sacred* and *profane*, in which they try to obtain one with the other, as has been thus far laid out.

From the outset of “The Sisters” the *simony* is evident in the relationship of the priest to the narrator, specifically in the concept of friendship between the two. Nonetheless, the exact nature or archetype of this *friendship* is suspect.

When the priest dies, the narrator is informed under the word “old friend”, disdainfully by an ancillary character named Cotter who has visited his household to have supper with the family. It is an odd choice of words as the boy reacts with a simple “[W]ho?”, as if he or the reader for that matter does not know of who it should be despite the narrative leading to this point by focusing on the priest’s impending demise. It is also peculiar that the narrative should so distinctly do so. Firstly as it is clear that the boy thinks nothing bad of the priest, though not much evidence would surmount to say that they would be categorically “friends”, and, yet, secondly as the text thereafter goes into an illusionary diatribe against the priest in which the narrator’s elders insist on the priest’s detrimental nature towards youth, of which the Cotter character comments: “Because their minds are so impressionable. When children see things like that, you know it has an effect ...” (*D* 2). A comment so abhorrent to the narrator that he crams his mouth with food “for fear that I might give utterance to my anger” (*D* 2). Still, the “it” in question is also undefined, as the dialogue, much like the remainder of the story, leaves it an open problem. Exactly what this “it” is cannot be answered in certainty. “It” could be, and most likely is, the corrupting nature of the church, or merely a figurative violation of innocence, but it is a corruption nonetheless. This is brought to the fore as the story, at its heart, focuses on the relationship of the priest to the narrator, which is meant to be an influence that has a subtext of perniciousness despite the amiable light in which the narrator presents their “friendship”.

Two distinct varieties of “friendship” exist within the presentation. While it is clearly understood outside of the narrator’s direct attitude that there is a harmful nature to the priest who seeks to mold younger characters after himself, the narrator himself gives no claims to the same nature and views the priest at least in a semi-innocent light. It has been suggested that this is a

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

form of *simony* in which the priest taints a sacred object of friendship with that of profane aims. More particularly, it is suggested that the priest, as a divine maligner, seeks to mold youth after himself in a search for corporeal immortality, thus negating the ideal (*sacred*) concept of friendship in the act and thereby equating to *simony*. Dilworth specifically draws attention to the inter-correlation between the narrator and priest in this light, stating that “any ulterior motive diminishes friendship. Friendship is spiritual because its essence is love, one of the three ‘theological virtues.’ An ulterior motive in friendship seeks to exchange something spiritual for nonspiritual gain. Such an exchange fits the definition of simony” (Dilworth 102). As to the confusing nature of the story in which the madness of the priest is left to the interpretation of the reader, Dilworth also notes that this is derivative of the simoniac nature of the priest’s motives, even sufficing to explain the elusive meaning behind his dream in which the priest appears to the narrator and where the words are mute and unknown, as they serve to represent the powerlessness of the priest, in which “simony would nevertheless serve as a metaphor for the selfishness of his motive” (102). Though explained by *simony*, the priest bears the role of the archetypal image of corruption, encompassed in the corrupted character of the outcast, madman, or scapegoat that he fills and which is to be found in the other stories of *Dubliners* as well as throughout Joyce’s works. As the archetypal character of the Corrupted, Albert hypothesizes that the ultimate end would have been to taint the narrator as well, the priest dragging him into his so-called “madness”, and insists that the priest “is a metaphor for what would have become of the author, had he [the narrator] permitted himself to be seduced into the service of the Church”⁹ (Albert 357). The friendship is therefore a parasitic one of *simony* in which the reserved *sacred* aspects of the motive are tainted by an agent of the *profane*. The agent that acts as a corrupting influence, whether be in the form of an archetypal corrupted character or a corrupting motif upon the protagonists within *Dubliners*, is, therefore, best classified as the *simony*.

Inasmuch as *paralysis* is the motif and *gnomon* is the framework of the stories, *simony* is but one further aspect of the motif that shines light upon the motivations of the characters and gives the stories archetypal thematic patterning. To this regard, *simony* acts as the instances

⁹ Such an archetypal motif of the Church, specifically, acting as corrupted and thereby as an antagonistic agent in conflict with the progression of the protagonist is also seen in *A Portrait of the Artist as A Young Man* in the multiple instances throughout the narrative structure when Stephen Dedalus shall be confronted through temptation to resort to the Church as means of personal salvation. Art, in Stephen Dedalus’ case, comes to save the protagonist by acting as an archetypal motif of innocence.

which make tangible the desires of the characters, whose actions lead not to their desired ends, as they always prove out of reach, but to failure to act, resulting in no character progression. Burgess notes that culmination of such a *paralysis* stemming from inability is inherent to the plot structure of *Dubliners*, claiming that the characters themselves “must either lead to destruction of the plot or the falsifying of those who must enact it” (*ReJoyce* 55). In this regard the purpose of *simony* becomes clearer, as, opposed to *gnomon* in which the reader is left to piece to the symbology of the story together, *simony* is the direct means by which the motivations of the characters are apparent in terms of the lack of ability to progress as characters, though no true narrative nature of the stories as presented as such is given (i.e., the *gnomon*). Here, overarching all of three, again, is the archetype of *the shadow*, in which the character fails to confront its motivations or character, leading to no resolution in plot to which *paralysis* and *gnomon* apply. Indeed, the shadow is but the external gnomonic understanding gathered by the reader, from a lack of resolution within the stories proper, whose *profane* elements are issued within the text, though whose *sacred* underlying meaning are a riddle to be unraveled.

3.2. Reading *Dubliners* through Its Shadows

As a pertinent tangential aspect of the shadow being represented through *paralysis*, *gnomon* and *simony*, many critics have expressly and repeatedly established the nature of *Dubliners* as related to Joyce’s critical stance upon the stagnation of Irish society of when it was written. Such a conclusion on *paralysis* as the watchword by which *Dubliners* is to be judged is not a controversial one. Albeit Joyce’s novels have received more than their fair share of attention in literary analysis, *Dubliners* has not been overlooked; the literature on which heavily rests and concurs upon the exact concept of “paralysis” for their critique. Anthony Burgess noted that all stories “in *Dubliners* are studies in paralysis” (*ReJoyce* 44). Indeed, this lens of paralysis is old hat; the general consensus being that

Dubliners has begun to seem more and more ‘writerly’ in the sense that the stories appear to function less as product than as process ... We have more and more that sense that in the process of reading the text we are completing it, producing new versions of it, writing it anew. (Norris, *Suspicious Readings* 6)

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Truthfully, it is to be in a difficult position to analyze the work as otherwise, due to Joyce's own free admission. In a letter to his friend Constantine P. Curran¹⁰, he freely stated: "I am writing a series of epicleti – ten – for a paper. I have written one. I call the series *Dubliners* to betray the soul of that hemiplegia or *paralysis* which many consider a city" (*Letters* 55; emphasis added). As much as many would like to do so at times, it is hard to argue with any author, let alone an author such renowned as Joyce. However, given the above discussion of *the sacred* and *the profane*, it may also be argued that Joyce was trying to imbue the profane with the sacred by undertaking the writing of a seemingly objective work of reality, assigning a nature of meaning that would be found beneath the mere mundane that would speak a certain truth to power. In support of this claim, it need be pointed up that it was not Joyce's singular aim to write a didactic diatribe in search of expressly demonstrating and listing the flaws of the Ireland of his time, but to colour these stories in a varied hue that compiled them as one. It is also done with much grace and consideration to the world of his time. Joyce himself, in a letter to his editor Grant Richards in pursuit of trying to have his collection published in spite of fears of indecency due to the fact that he strove to write the real as he saw it, notes that "the odour of ashpits and old weeds and offal hangs round my stories. I seriously believe that you will retard the course of civilization in Ireland by preventing the Irish from having one good look at themselves in my nicely polished looking glass" (*Letters* 64). To defend Joyce's own assertions of this case, it is worth noting that in "Araby", he details a setting rich in the everyday, not with harsh words, but in loving reminiscence, using the exact words quoted in the letter above:

The career of our play brought us through the dark muddy lanes behind the houses where we ran the gauntlet of the rough tribes from the cottages, to the back doors of the dark dripping gardens where odours arose from the ashpits, to the dark odorous stables where a coachman smoothed and combed the horse or shook music from the buckled harness. (*D* 15)

¹⁰ They had been boys together in Belvedere and fellow-students at the University. At the time Joyce wrote the letter Mr. Curran had just joined the Four Courts (Dublin) service and been posted to the Accountant – General office. For more on their relationship see Ellmann, *JJ* 63.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

The ruddy and rough realism Joyce finds in these features and with which he enwraps the stories of *Dubliners* is clue to the essence of which he wanted to purvey by the stories as a whole; the object as a thing, perceived for what it is, both in beauty and fault, in its sacred and profane aspects. Joyce begs the reader to examine his texts closely and *Dubliners* is no exception.

Veritably, the simplicity of the stories' banalities of the descriptive mundane life of their characters is subjected towards result in conclusions of a seemingly apparent variety, sufficiently so that one would think the text to be straightforward. "But they are, of course, *deceptively* simple, and their deception resides precisely in the fact that, beyond their narrative unreliability, there is much complex signifying activity going on in each story, and this *in and of itself* requires interpretation" (Norris, *Suspicious Readings* 14).

Contestable is such any interpretation when the devil is in the details and any one rough guiding light may be applied in interpretation, but it need not be singular as all interpretations add their own to the discussion of the text. Here this work seeks to unravel the *shadow* archetype as that which makes these stories so readily understood in literary analysis, though it need not disclude other claims to their meaning.

Specifically, it was under the archetype of the *shadow* of *paralysis* that *Dubliners* was written under the guise of a triumvirate of *paralysis*, *gnomon* and *simony* which all equally act in accordance as the archetype of *the shadow*. The character of each story strives to attain that which is beyond their reach through means of which are insufficient and leave them lacking. This is *simony*. Their inability, or rather the character not-reaching a new stage of progress through confrontation of the conflict, is *paralysis*. Burgess supports this view, stating that it stems from the characters' lack of any revelation that is manifested within the text; despite their will or motivation, they are all subject to "the submission to routines and the fear of breaking them" (*ReJoyce* 44) which ultimately destroys "the emancipation that is sought" (44) as it is "not sought hard enough" (44). Burgess also underscores the fact that the *paralysis* and inability to emerge from it for each character stems from the fact that the characters portrayed attitude are "punctured by weakness of the flesh" (*ReJoyce* 44). Given this view, it would seem then that the *shadow* of the unseen yet apparent devices which control the character and prevent them from making a point of narrative progression as to resolve their conflict is ever present within each story as well as the aim of the work. However, though left open in all cases, the reader does

indeed know of the character's fate as forever unchanging or wasted as the symbology or structure of the narrative would portend, as it represented in the *gnomon*.

It is by this framework of the *shadow* of *paralysis* that the work shall now be more deeply investigated as according the more specific archetypal structures it utilizes.

Paralysis is also the incantation by which *Dubliners* begins and the eulogy by which it ends, which itself is also mirrored by the archetype of death, finding a place throughout the collection.

3.2.1. *The Two of Whom?*

As to return to "The Sisters", the narrator opens the first paragraph with "[T]here was no hope for him this time" (D 1). The narrator is clearly speaking of the inability of change, that a conclusion has been reached and there is but no escape of it. Still, he ends with "[I]t [the paralysis] filled me with fear, and yet I longed to be nearer to it and to look upon its deadly work" (D 1). This is a striking contrast, as though it sets the tone by which it is expected that nothing may be achieved, still the narrator desires deeper examination of the paralysis.

The title of "Two Sisters" reflects the *gnomon* itself as there is but one sister who actually takes part in the story, while the other is referenced, yet indistinct. The main character and narrator are also not the same person, reflecting two points as referenced as well. As if it were an Irish *Citizen Kane* or *Ikiru*, the protagonist is the priest, who, not-long deceased, is not present and whom we see having his life examined by the supporting cast of characters as to be illustrated to the reader. The ultimate decision on his "madness" and paralysis is thereby left open to interpretation by the reader, wherein the ending trails off leaving the reader to assemble the symbols thus given within the story into a coherent conclusion. The lines of "there was something gone wrong with him. ..." (D 7) not only allude to the main concern of the text, but to the forthcoming stories as well, as, all main characters do have "something wrong" with them but it is still left to the reader to guess as to what that something is since the allusion is merely there, even when more direct. This *gnomon* is but the mystery of which the clues of each story point to in separate cases of *paralysis*.

It is peculiar to point out that “The Sisters” is the only story in which the narrator is not the same as the main character (save for which there is a limited-omnipotent narrator through the lens of one singular character). The narrator acts as the archetype of the persona of the *self*.

In Jungian terms, the persona is “the individual’s system of adaptation to, or the manner he assumes in dealing with, the world. ... One could say, with a little exaggeration, that the persona is that which in reality one is not, but which oneself as well as others think one is” (122; vol. 9, pt. 1), or when it comes to the characters of *Dubliners*, “one that I will never become”. Their individuation and transformation never happens. Having declined “eternal recreation”, these characters refused the nature of their *self*, self that is a “life’s goal, for it is the completes expression of that fateful combination we call individuality” (Jung 404; vol. 7). The circle of despair and paralysis continues, though every time manifested differently.

The nature of paralysis is also indirectly alluded to when the narrator claims a repulsion yet fascination when thinking of the priest. “But now it sounded to me like the name of some maleficent and sinful being. It filled me with fear, and yet I longed to be nearer to it and to look upon its deadly work” (*D* 1).

The idea of Catholicism as a driving force of paralysis within *Dubliners* or the other works of Joyce is also standard to Joycean scholarship. Dilworth goes so far as to state that this same irreconcilability of *simony* exists throughout all of Joyce’s works as concerns the Catholic church, in which “the inclinations of the protagonists of *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait of the Artist* to become priests are, we know, simoniac” (Dilworth 103). In “The Sisters” Joyce aims to present the nature of corruption of youth by the Church through archetypal figures of fatherhood and childhood. The boy, having no father, lives with an aunt and uncle who seem to bear no air of authority among the boy, and even seem to earn his ire, yet the priest seems to receive his reverence and respect, although the narrator and the subtext make it clear it may be undeserved. The relationship between the two characters though is antagonistic and not one of companionship.

3.2.2. Calling out to a Drowning Eveline

Joyce makes the crossover from childhood to adult experiences, from being totally unaware to partial realization of conflict, in “Eveline” as the text offers a conspicuous change in

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

language and tone which indicates a break in the narrative. The 1st person narration Joyce replaces with a limited third-person perspective, thereby achieving a wider picture or window into the character. Yet, the reader is left as interpreter to the events and ultimately concludes them, as shall be shown.

Dubliners is fertile ground for the criticism often thrown, for that matter, at other modern works as well, which seek to display phenomena free of supposed objective narratology; i.e., not through ideals or philosophical views, but as they are *per se*. Namely, the antagonism central to plot development is found to be absent within *Dubliners* of which, “Eveline”, as a case in point, bears a denouement of events in which she is lead to challenge her thereto existence. However, any resolution is shattered, as opposed to the reader’s expectations, as well as in contrast to inherent and classically expected lines of actions within literature. Much like the film classic of *Casablanca*, the protagonist of “Eveline” defies the events that have lead to the conclusion, despite the repeated symbols of decay and despair of her life. “Eveline” does not culminate in the awakening of the protagonist. Instead, it results in the succumbing to an acceptance of the inevitable – a completion which would be considered to be only fragmentary.

Were it not for the reader’s own conclusions or the textual display of the story of which the character and their motivations are the focus, as well as the free archetypal associations of how and in which manner a character is to act when confronted with a motif, it might be true that the stories are lacking in some crucial aspect or element. However, a reader of the story, unless done only superficially, would not find it to be so. Indeed, the areas removed for the pleasure of the reading and challenge to the readers is what makes them unique. As Scholes has so distinctly noted, in *Dubliners* Joyce has opted for

an internal perspective fixed in a mind which is not only deprived of certain knowledge about the events of the story but which is absolutely limited in education and intelligence. These limited minds trying to cope with painful situations, more than anything else, give the stories their ironic and naturalistic flavour. And this method posed for Joyce an aesthetic problem that he delighted in solving – the problem of paralepse, of conveying to the reader more information than the code required by his perspective ‘ought’ to convey. (69)

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Therein, the exclusionary stylistic choices to *Dubliners* comes part and parcel of its literary understandings, of which “Eveline” is a prime example, wherein the lack of resolution creates it as such along the motif of *paralysis*, *gnomon*, and *simony*.

Eveline is confronted with herself as the conflict. Subject to the archetype of an overbearing father and mother archetype, she fulfills the standard definition of the damsel archetype who is waiting to be rescued. Yet, when the archetype of the prince comes, the motif should be that she runs away and lives happily ever after. However, Eveline’s act of final refusal of elopement necessitates that the protagonist has not overcome the conflict as set out within the rising action of the plot. As with the other characters of *Dubliners*, resolution of the same conflict has been directly omitted in “Eveline”. While a climax has been indeed reached, the falling action of the plot is anti-climactic to it. Moreover, it is stylistically different to that of the rising action, as where the latter details a narration from the limited viewpoint of Eveline’s perspective, listing a series of memories that are given as an amalgamation of time and reflection on past events, the falling action details a specific event in real time, denoting the importance of the decision as juxtaposed to the situation of which the protagonist is placed.

A reader unfamiliar with the disparity of *Dubliners* as opposed to the traditional narrative would presume Eveline to emerge on a boat, looking away at Dublin’s dock as she sailed from the trap of which had once found herself. Yet, this is not the case. The reader is instead forced believe that she has not been freed from her torment. Instead, what has occurred is that her situation may be left even worse off than prior to the opening as she has been tempted but has not followed through. Therein, as has been noted already, conflict has been given light but not resolution. As Scholes has noted, “the story closes with the strong implication that her original condition resumes, only intensified by her having missed this chance to leave Dublin and change her life” (62). This same implication can be found to bear literary truth in that the reader, as evidenced by the *gnomon*, sees no happy ending for her, nor for any character of *Dubliners*. Nothing of the protagonist’s plight has led to this conclusion. In fact, the rejection of supposed liberation cements the trap of which she has been encompassed. As a protagonist the *simony* of the corrupting nature of the both mother and father archetype are prevalent. The protagonist not only finds conflict within herself, acting as her own antagonist, but originating from these two archetypes of the authoritarian father and mother.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

However, this need not necessarily be a lack of resolution. It may also be argued that the narrative structure does actually come to a resolution in its actions, resulting in the acceptance of her plight, as seen through the metaphor of “like a helpless animal. Her eyes gave him no sign of love or farewell or recognition” (*D* 23). However, this only accounts as a narrative sign that denotes resolution, but gives none in practice. Through the *gnomon*, the reader is to know extension of the subtext, wherein there is a lack of resolution, in which the falling action lies within the syntax and signs that do conclude in a resolution in the actual text but have their existence in the meta-extension of the subtext. It is here claimed that one of the supporting features in which the reader may venture such a conclusion is that the archetype of mother, father, and powerless daughter fills in the blanks, so to speak, of what is to happen as according to the cognizant understanding of the inherent nature to these archetypes in unison.

There is debate that “Eveline” may be an object to white slavery in which her sojourn to South America would result in actual slavery as opposed to the spiritual slavery she is already subjected to within her hometown of Dublin. Laura Barberan Reinares in her article “Frankly Speaking, ‘The men that is now is only all palaver and what they can get out of you’: Migration and White Slavery in Argentina in Joyce’s ‘Eveline’”, has noted that this was a common phenomenon of the times of which *Dubliners* was composed.¹¹ However, if the decision of the protagonist is taken as either being saved from yet another form of slavery or deciding to not undergo change as a character within the story as presented, it still leads to the same conclusion of which Eveline is *paralyzed*.

As the story is not left open to chance interpretation, “Eveline” encompasses the motif of a woman’s journey, at the moment from when the young woman becomes less of the irresponsible and wistful girl and more of the realistic adult. No longer a girl and not that yet of a woman, progressing from an archetype of the damsel to that of the adult necessitates assuming the role of her mother. This decision solidifies her coming full circle from merely being the daughter to that of the mother. Eveline’s paralysis comes as she feels committed to keeping “the promise to her mother, her promise to keep the home together as long as she could” (*D* 22) and is unable to board the ship.

¹¹ For an insightful analysis of the moral panic about migration and white slavery in Europe and South America, where Eveline could be seen as a potential sex slave, see Barberán Reinares pp. 46-59.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Eveline also incorporates herself into the rich heritage of the “damsel in distress” archetypal character who, by definition, acts as mere literary device for the hero to come to the rescue of the damsel. However, Joyce places this archetype onto its head, by not having the *deus-ex-machina* resolution of the prince solving the conflict within such a fairy tale context. “Eveline”, firstly, provides a narrative perspective from within the damsel character herself, omitted from a fairytale proper. Secondly, no archetype of a damsel in distress is to abandon their supposed liberation, but Eveline chooses to do so, thereby creating a self-referential loop in which she enslaves herself to the helpless archetype of the damsel and liberates herself from the conclusions of it as a motif as such. As Scholes states, “the prince comes to rescue the princess from the villain’s dungeon, but she decides finally that the dungeon is less frightening than the thought of leaving it, and sends the hero home empty-handed. Naturalism sometimes generates its ‘authenticity’ by the inversion of romance” (62). This inversion, as Scholes puts it, contributes to the *gnomon* of which the reader would be aware. Thereby, acting as a reference outside of the text but evident to the reader, the lack of resolution appears twofold in its conclusions.

The text also makes apparent that Eveline’s lackluster absconding with Frank may bring no resolution in the ultimate sense, as it is no guarantee of the resolution to the conflict in which she finds herself in the antagonism with her mother’s archetypal character, merely a change of setting. The lines preceding the final conclusion to the story reiterate the uncertainty faced by even a heroic and standard conclusion to the text: “She trembled as she heard again her mother’s voice saying constantly with foolish insistence: ‘Derevaun Seraun! Derevaun Seraun!’” (*D* 23). “Derevaun Seraun!” is of academic dispute in its origins, but may be a transliteration of the Gaelic for the phrase “after pleasure, there is pain”¹² implying that the escape of which the prince archetype of Frank extends to the damsel Eveline is of no resolution as the conflict lay within the *paralysis* of Eveline within her setting, particularly of that with her mother, who is the one to impart these words upon Eveline. Thereby, the motif of mother becoming daughter and *vice versa* is the actual objective of the story. The narrative structure of the story is therein not that of the protagonist’s conflict with the self, but of the antagonistic conflict with the self in the process

¹² Don Gifford, in his annotation to Joyce, expresses duality in the meaning of the phrase “Derevaun Seraun”, words of Eveline’s mother on her deathbed. He depicts that Patrick Henchy is of the opinion that the words are corrupt Gaelic “the end of please is pain”, while Roland Smith believes they are corrupt Irish “the end of the song is raving madness”. Either way the phrase perfectly fits into the pendulum model of Eveline’s behaviour: “to leave or not to leave”. On this particular matter, see Gifford pp. 50-51.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

of change. Here it is the daughter to the mother, or the archetypal experience of maturing and the recognition of change which arises thereof. Jung notes that the “influences which the literature describes as being exerted on the children do not come from the mother herself, but rather from the archetype projected upon her, which gives her a mythological background and invests her with authority and numinosity” (*Four Archetypes* 16). Consequently, the essence of “Eveline” is the narrative’s association with the protagonist struggling against the consumption of the self by the other, here in the form of the mother to the daughter.

Another motif in *Dubliners* that appears commonly is the inability to travel or to arrive at a given destination, despite efforts to do so. In typical narrative form, a protagonist, before setting out on a journey, is to have a call first given to the journey, whether it be figurative or literal, and then to have assistance given from another, who has made the journey already, which shall prove useful later when difficulty arises. *Dubliners* does the opposite of which “Eveline” is prime example. When the opportunity is at hand and the journey to begin, a voice calls out and warns against departing. Typically, this voice should provide the assistance to guide the protagonist, not make them succumb to doubt and end the journey before it even commences. Eveline encounters such a voice in her mother, arising from the dead, as a warning. It is fitting then that it should come from a late mother at the exact moment of transformation within the protagonist as Jung notes that it is within the domain of the mother archetype to hold power over “the place of magic transformation and rebirth, together with the underworld and its inhabitants” (*Four Archetypes* 15). Moreover, Jung also sheds light on why the mother character, who has been silent for the text suddenly appears in memory form to the protagonist. Since “the mother archetype may connote anything secret, hidden, dark; the abyss, the world of the dead, anything that devours, seduces, and poisons, that is terrifying and inescapable like fate” (*Four Archetypes* 15). It is only appropriate that the mother suddenly contribute a few words, even if their meaning be unclear, as to illuminate on the events that have already transpired. As archetype she may nurture the daughter protectively or overcome her and not allow her maturity, but it is the voice of the archetype that allows for the denouement to come to the fore as the actual meaning of the plot in which change or transformation is refused to come to the surface. This then is not the nurturing mother, of which Eveline is actually taking on the role, but rather the authoritarian mother archetype which seeks to control.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Pertinent it would be here to beg the question of the ancestor motif within Joyce and how it also would appear to go against common sense literary narratives in which the voice of the ancestor spirit is to provide assistance to the living, as a spiritual guide. Such a voice is revealed typically in stories as the archetype of the wise old man or woman who imparts information that shall save the protagonist at a later point of departure from the path of the protagonist as they confront the antagonist. One interpretation of “Eveline” would show this to be contrary as the voice of her mother does not assist her, but rather binds Eveline to her fate.

Apart from being controlled by her mother, Joyce has also chosen to represent Eveline in conflict with her father, or, at the very least, using her father as a symbol of the conflict. Ultimately, Eveline does submit to the mother and not the father, and opposes her own archetypal nature of damsel in distress by giving herself over to the mother, defying expectation. However, Jung specifically notes that, in archetypal terms, it is to be expected that “the woman who fights against her father still has the possibility of leading an instinctive, feminine existence, because she rejects only what is alien to her” (186; vol. 9, pt. 1). It would seem then that this comes in accordance with the damsel aspect of Eveline’s archetype as she is in conflict and is seeking to fight against the authoritarianism of the father in the majority of the text, something originating outside of herself.

The contrast comes at the end of the text when Eveline seemingly fights against her mother and fails, or is enveloped into the mother archetype itself. In doing so, however, Eveline comes into conflict with herself, as the daughter archetype who finds conflict with the mother, and is “at the risk of injury to her instincts, [to] attain to greater consciousness, because in repudiating the mother she repudiates all that is obscure, instinctive, ambiguous, and unconscious in her own nature” (Jung 186; vol. 9, pt.1). The text comes to reveal that the plot does not ultimately revolve around a conflict between the protagonist and the other but the protagonist and herself in the transformation of one into the other, of the protagonist failing to transform anew and simply falling into the abyss of antagonism, *vis-à-vis* their transformation into the antagonist. When the pivotal juncture of the story comes at the point of which the protagonist is expected to overcome the conflict, the *gnomon* thereafter becomes clear to the reader of a paralysis in which the crocheted cannot escape and it which was not the actual terms of the conflict. This, again, is typical in the narrative structure of each story in *Dubliners*.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

In actuality, the turn of fate as presented by the descending action of Eveline should be expected. At the commencement of the story, Eveline is “tired”. Her mother is dead and she misses her siblings, from which it should be immediately evident that she is in conflict with having to take on the role of her mother from the outset. Jung claims in the relationship of the parent to the child as well as in archetypes that resolution can only be found in the source of the conflict:

Every father is given the opportunity to corrupt his daughter’s nature, and the educator, husband, or psychiatrist then has to face the music. For what has been spoiled by the father can only be made good by a father, just as what has been spoiled by the mother can only be repaired by a mother. The disastrous repetition of the family pattern could be described as the psychological original sin, or as the curse of the Atrides running through the generations. (232; vol. 14)

Therein, the conflict in this story cannot come from the father only; it is but false allusion and excuse for one’s insecurity in their decisions: “now that she was about to leave ... she did not find it a wholly undesirable life” (*D* 21).

Eveline’s mother has passed before the story has opened. Her brothers, of whom one is deceased and the other is always away involved in chapel restoration, are but second to her father, whom she and her brother support. The father is at times nurturing, but is alluded to that he had been known to be abusive to the mother as well as to Eveline. In this fictional family framework, however, can be found two distinct archetypes of the father and mother, as may also be found in other stories of the collection to varying degrees. In “Eveline”, these two archetypes function in a dual nature between the archetype of mother or father as nurturing or authoritarian figure.

The mother, in a somewhat spiritual form, is also present at the culmination of the story. The mother herself is an archetype, but functions as both one who is overbearing and one who is nurturing, or, at the very least, can be analyzed as such. Moreover, while the mother may be dead, the daughter has taken on the role of her *archetype* as she is caretaker to her father as well as female confidant to her brother.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

It is noteworthy, as concerns the structure of narratives, that the common motif of assistance that arises from beyond, whether it be natural or supernatural, is also found within this story within the allusion to the mother prior to the boarding of the boat. Functioning as a *deus ex machina*, the mother's interjection into the state of affairs at the end is not this same voice of help and may even be criticized as a way to culminate the events as is. However, this would be ignoring the object of the narrative. As opposed to the actual assistance that comes within the story, here are the archetypes of authority preventing a story from happening. No assistance is given to the journey, but a finalization. Jung notes that these archetypes of the authority of the parents are inescapable in the sense that they are carried by the self and intervene accordingly.

Because we cannot discover God's throne in the sky with a radiotelescope or establish (for certain) that a beloved father or mother is still about in a more or less corporeal form, people assume that such ideas are 'not true'. I would rather say that they are not 'true' *enough*, for these are conceptions of a kind that have accompanied human life from prehistoric times, and that still break through into consciousness at any provocation. (*Man and his Symbols* 87).

They are to arise at any given time. "Eveline", as it pivots upon the conflict of the self to the archetype of the father and mother, naturally rests upon the mother (or father) intervening and disallowing for any change to conclusion to occur. It is an element therefore of *deus ex machina*, but it is one that solidifies the conflict and not one that merely is chosen to conclude the story.

In short, the particulars of the actual text of "Eveline" are prey to the archetypes that underlie it and which guide the reader in knowing the meaning of the text while still not actually being aware of the significance of such meaning. The *gnomon* in which the reader may witness the *paralysis* is only existent because of the archetype which is both utilized and violated within the text. Indeed the reader is called upon to reach the conclusion alone as there is but an abrupt ending that does not signify the true conclusion. Through omission of the direct immutable conclusion of a foreknowledge in which Eveline never progresses in her fulfillment of protagonist and succumbs to the antagonism wrought within her,

this takes Joyce in the direction of what Roland Barthes calls the *scriptible* text, a modernist fiction which forces the reader to participate in the creation of its events and meanings ... he stops well short of giving us liberty to construct what meanings we please. Our inferences are guided, unobtrusively but firmly, in ways that we have been investigating and will continue to investigate. (Scholes 69)

Dubliners continually relies on a narrative structure in which a fantasy of what the protagonist may be is alluded to if only the *paralysis* was first removed. The narrative itself is not always as what is presented, but what it “could be” if a circumstance or integral element was changed. The illumination found in the narrative generally arises from that which has not happened as opposed to that which does. Unlike the expected narrative in which the protagonist overcomes their conflict and finds resolution, *Dubliners* offers characters who are only whole when their lack of action or flaws are incorporated. Yet, as concerns the action of the story, it is that which does not happen, the unreal, which makes the stories reflect upon themselves to the reader. Gabriel in “The Dead” silently criticizes his supporting cast of characters; the conflict experienced never ignites inasmuch as it does in his imagination. The speech he gives is not inflammatory but complacent, allowing him later to question his own judgments.

3.2.3. “Araby” – “For Love at first is all afraid”¹³

In “Araby”, the narrator’s inability to purchase a token item to express his love forces him to question himself and his motives as being the romanticizing of childishness, as well as presents the reader with a negative association with the paralytic nature of the Irish setting as being a restraint on the protagonist.

“Araby” closes the triad on childhood within the collection, where the prison of routine is one of the main themes, as seen from the narrator’s perspective. Describing the daily life of a schoolboy, from an adult perspective, amongst this paralytic pattern of his reminiscence on his life in Dublin, comes an infatuation with a friend’s (Mangan’s) older sister. This character, though nameless, is written as a contrast to the bleak home life he faces, who turns into the cause of the narrator’s “confused adoration” (*D* 16). Descriptive power itself prevails in the opening

¹³ Joyce, *Chamber Music* XXX 4

paragraph, where the street in which the boy lives is “blind”, suggesting the motif of *paralysis*. Such instances of careful and selective writing make Joyce stand out as he has obviously pained over minor usages to create coherence between all parts of the text even on the level of the individual phrase to express the motif itself. The portrayal of the street is therefore symbolic in nature: “[t]he other houses ... gazed at one another with *brown imperturbable faces*” (*D* 15; emphasis added). The color brown here is not only used to describe the motif of paralysis but also distraction, as is found throughout *Dubliners*. Both are embodied in Mangan’s sister, for whom the unnamed narrator, “kept her brown figure always in my [his] eye” (*D* 16). Though inhibited in showing his apparent romantic feelings, the narrator is completely enchanted with every appearance of the girl. In this vein, she could be seen as a *temptress* distracting the narrator from his everyday life: “Her image accompanied me even in places the most hostile to romance” (*D* 16). With the provided description in the story, she also fits the *nun* and *virgin* archetypes stemming from her religious nature, noting her “retreat that week in her convent” (*D* 17). Mangan’s sister also displays characteristics of the “Good Mother”. Even though she is presumably young, she is written as being a more mature and responsible figure akin to a motherly essence – echoing the fact that the narrator himself lacks a mother, instead living with a semi-distant aunt and alcoholic uncle. Being the object of his affection, the narrator strives nothing more than to gain and hold her attention. He takes it upon his fantasy that if he were able to express his love for her through a memento from a bazaar she was unable to attend, it would somehow transform the situation. By setting his sights on obtaining the McGuffin, an actually means of *simony* in obtaining what he thought would be revealed to him through love, it transforms his perspective but not the situation.

Campbell, when discussing Islamic mythology, notes that there is a shared thread between European and Mid-Eastern Oriental traditions where there is frequently “a type of tale of enchantment and disenchantment” (*The Masks of God* 136; vol. 4) in the journey quest for the object which is most commonly represented “on the European side ... by the legends of the Grail” (136). “Araby” is set apart by these as it does not contain one particular component that traditionally allows for the revelation to occur when either obtaining the object itself or obtaining its knowledge even through the quest. As in “Araby” in these tales “the hero is generally one, set apart by disposition or accident, who comes by chance upon a situation of enchantment” (Campbell, *The Masks of God* 136; vol. 4). This would clearly be the narrator, but, what is

lacking is that, “[T]here is always someone present familiar with the rules of this enchantment, yet nothing can be done without the help of an innocent youth, whose arrival is helplessly awaited” (Campbell, *The Masks of God* 136; vol. 4). Therein, without the incorporative aspects of the motif, the narrator here is left without a revelation gained through success, but through failure, which is counterpoised to the original enchantment itself.

In this manner, “Araby” itself is commonly described as one expressing “illusion, disillusionment, and coming to awareness” (Tindall, *A Reader’s Guide to James Joyce* 19) which corresponds to this archetypal journey pattern in which the obtaining of an object changes the nature of the world (but not necessarily for the better). The object here is not even gained, a failed quest. Instead, the gnomon of the object is offered. The girl may be read as pursuing love, but it need not be romantic as is commonly associated. It may also be read as a story of initiation; of the boy’s quest for the ideal and it resembles the archetypal myth of the quest for a holy talisman. “The Church, after all, is a more or less Oriental foundation, and the ecclesiastical suggestion of Araby ... is supported by metaphor” (Tindall, *Guide to James Joyce* 20). What is important is that the original adoration comes to naught and is destroyed when the profane nature of it replaces the ideal. It may be read as a holy quest, quoting Tindall, “here again we have a disappointed quest ... this time ... for Ireland’s Church” (*Guide to James Joyce* 19), where the mundane nature of the everyday wears down the ability to experience a true vision of one’s idealized forms (the boy is late to the bazaar as his uncle is most likely drunk and has forgotten as a consequence).

While the protagonist’s archetypal motif of a quest is initiated by feelings, emotions, and thoughts of childishly placed affection, where his actions and thoughts lead him to embark on a quest to obtain a gift for the girl, at the end of the story “a young boy faces a dark epiphany in which his dreams of being a bold knight-errant fade as he accepts his failure” (Hobby 62). What we have here is an archetypal Joycean epiphany “revealing that there is nothing behind the illusive shadow of the woman he [the boy] fabricates and in which he [the boy] believes, brings anger and anguish” (Hobby 62). This is one of those often small, but definitive moments, after which life is never quite the same again: “Gazing up into the darkness I saw myself as a creature driven and derided by vanity; and my eyes burned with anguish and anger” (*D* 19).

Let alone this failure of the protagonist to achieve his aims, he realizes there is nothing that can outgrow his surroundings and the reader is left with his or her own realized frustration of

him not being able to do so as well. Thereafter comes the disappointment which results in an epiphany: an awareness where something he once believed to be sacred and beautiful turns out to be shallow and trivialize while he is at the bazaar alone and observes the other boy-girl conversations and relationships. In such manner, Mangan's sister could also represent Ireland itself as a country as well, her religious nature, with her contour (shadow) but never in full appearance, always hiding and not willing to be seen in full light (just as in the story, she is inaccessible for the boy to be seen in her fullest form). Even their conversation is reduced to the minimum in this complete paralysis which is reflected in every character within the story. This is in accord with Joyce's wider writing, as Ireland is always yellow and brown, or muddy and dark, symbolizing simultaneously the Earth Mother (i.e., Ireland) and "the process of passivity and debilitation" (Cirlot 52) (i.e., the life in Ireland).

Given the end disenchantment, the gnomon of "Araby" follows the pattern where it is known that the boy's quest is a failure, almost as a forgone conclusion, since he is unable to attain an object to bring back the girl's love from without. His quest for her love though also ends in failure as he is rewarded with the knowledge of the actualities of love, and not the idealization of it as it once had started. Similarly, in "An Encounter" the serendipitous nature of character's journey also results in a story wholly unlike an adventure, where the protagonist is left with an idyllic form destroyed.

In some manner, these characters serve as the basis of how Joyce approaches the protagonism of his characters in *Dubliners*. He writes his motifs as subject to "what may have been" as opposed to "what is" but it is only through this unreal reflection of "what has not been" or "what will not be" that the elucidation comes to fore of each story and the collection as a whole as the *gnomon* itself. Through each instance, the heartbreak of the inability to achieve small victories, leave the reader insightful into the nature of paralysis, as well as being paralyzed to even cry out to the protagonist: "But no! Why have/haven't you done that? It is so blatantly clear!"

3.3. "The Dead" – "What is a woman a symbol of?"

The appearance of a multifaceted *paralysis* in "The Dead" concludes the volume by rounding out all external factors lending themselves to an overt and omnipresent *paralysis*

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

expressed throughout the totality of *Dubliners* by way of examination of protagonist against the setting and conflict in which they are placed, incorporating disparate supporting antagonistic characters reflecting archetypes thereof. Therein, “The Dead” examines a paralysis that continues through a legacy in familial, cultural, historical, social, and other such associations.

As in the stories prior, Gabriel, the protagonist, is a limited narrator and a mediator, the one between the reader and the paralysis as subject to examination. The direct challenge that Gabriel faces is to give a speech at a dinner hosted by his aunts, something he has yet to decide what to say and which changes as he engages with the setting and other characters around him. He ultimately decides to not say anything but platitudes, where after the narrative shifts to his wife’s confession that she had loved another before him, resulting in Gabriel truly question himself and what he understands, perhaps the only character to do so within the entirety of the collection.

The narrative is revealed through Gabriel’s inner-monologue in relation to the paralysis of others. He is at first challenged repeatedly in his self-determined disassociation from his social and cultural settings with the other representative characters around him, and later challenged in his understandings of them by the character of his wife, through whom, his machinations, his core beliefs, or the idea of him being superior to others, are ultimately denied as the conclusion divulges that while he is not part of “the others” at the beginning of the text, through his own words, whom he mostly disdains for one reason or another, he is equally the paralysis of their encompass, as the end would show where he realizes his lack of understanding for his own wife. He does not even gather the courage to confront the others at the party, and, though he starts off certain in his desires, he is left ungrounded.

Joyce makes the first mention of Gabriel’s fancies of flight, at the beginning of the narrative, directly after Gabriel has arrived, wherein it is revealed that he is a giving a speech in honor of the event. He dreads the task and returns to minute monologues with himself about what should be said, but never brings himself to actually utter those words:

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

How cool it must be outside! How pleasant it would be to walk out alone, first along by the river and then through the park! The snow would be lying on the branches of the trees and forming a bright cap on the top of the Wellington Monument. How much more pleasant it would be there than at the supper-table!
(*D* 130)

The second mention comes directly before he begins the speech proper: “The air was pure there. In the distance lay the park where the trees were weighted with snow. The Wellington Monument wore a gleaming cap of snow that flashed westward over the white field of Fifteen Acres” (*D* 137).

Joyce makes it clear that Gabriel feels suffocated, alluding to pure, cool air. Yet, Gabriel cannot force himself to take a breath and repeats expected platitudes, no matter how touching they are, to the hosts and their guests.

Gabriel returns to this westward glance with the conclusion:

The time had come for him to set out on his journey westward. Yes, the newspapers were right: snow was general all over Ireland. ... It was falling, too, upon every part of the lonely churchyard on the hill where Michael Furey lay buried. It lay thickly drifted on the crooked crosses and headstones, on the spears of the little gate, on the barren thorns. His soul swooned slowly as he heard the snow falling faintly through the universe and faintly falling, like the descent of their last end, upon all the living and the dead. (*D* 152)

The paralysis of *Dubliners* is the death of the individual as they repeatedly prove incapable, whatever their faults or virtues, to escape from the vicious cycle they have been thrown into, built up around them or have allowed themselves to have fallen into. Whenever a new opportunity arises, a means to escape, a call to self-examination, or any ability in which the development may resolve in a re-examination, a change, an unseen development in both character and plot, it falls apart like brittle clay. One of the essential element of “The Dead” according to Benstock is “[T]he irreverence of Joyce’s depiction of Epiphany Day ... a reminder

that throughout the work of James Joyce it is spiritual death that is at the core of the paralytic condition, the hemiplegia of the will, the death of the heart” (“The Dead” 55).

As a counter argument, here arises Jungian approach and insistence that the failure must be recognized, if nothing else, then for the purpose of inner reconciliation: “A man should be able to say he has done his best to form a conception of life after death, or to create some image of it even if he must confess his failure” (*MDR* 302). That this is the “vital loss” Jung prolongs, “[F]or the question that is posed to him [man] is the age-old heritage of humanity: an archetype, rich in secret life, which seeks to add itself to our own individual life in order to make it whole” (*MDR* 302).

At the end of his partially autobiographical study *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, a special interest for Jung is an understanding of death¹⁴ particularly to a maturing person. Jung is principally assured in speaking of this matter, and for Jung “[T]o this end he [man] ought to have a myth about death, for reason shows him nothing but the dark pit into which he is descending” (308). However, “[M]yth, can conjure up other images ... helpful and enriching pictures of life in the land of the dead. ... But while the man who despairs marches toward nothingness, the one who has placed his faith in the archetype follows the tracks of life and lives right into his death” (*MDR* 306).

Gabriel seemingly returns to a conflict inside himself in which he has a strong desire to confront the reality of which he is placed, yet he is unwilling to do so. He is offered the chance at many times prior to delivering his dinner speech, always retreating from actually engaging with himself or other characters, as can be seen in the self-reflective interludes in the narration takes a limited view from his own opinion and perspective. These semi-omniscient narrations provide insight into the supposed actual opinion he possesses towards said conflict. Moreover, he doubly refuses to find resolution, failing to progress or make any movement against it, through the actual speech itself as he offers nothing more than the standard, though it does allude separately to the motif of *death*. Instead, he remains silent, which would then seem to reveal him as a protagonist, like the rest, who seeks no change in the line of their conflict and no resolution. This is more evident by the relation of the anecdote of the revolving horse between the two halves of

¹⁴ “People have the idea that the dead know far more than we, for Christian doctrine teaches that in the hereafter we shall ‘see face to face.’ Apparently, however, the souls of the dead ‘know’ only what they knew at the moment of death, and nothing beyond that. Hence their endeavor to penetrate into life in order to share in the knowledge of men” (Jung, *MDR* 308).

the narrative in which he takes on the role of the horse. After, as they have retreated to their boarding room, the story takes a different tone in which it becomes all too evident that Gabriel transforms through growing conscious of his lack of desire to actually undergo any character transformation, perhaps one of the few protagonists to do so. Burgess claims that the reflection of Gabriel upon the dead is in relation of how “Gabriel becomes aware of the world of the dead, into which the living passes” (*ReJoyce* 52). This revelation bears with it a reconciliation that Gabriel accepts that he may be not as knowledgeable as he thinks about himself or others, thereby freeing him of the paralysis of which he has subjected himself to.

“The Dead” as a narrative frequently returns to a theme of reflection on that which has passed. The motif of *death* itself is a reflection on the finality of the totality of events as they have already passed and learning from them. Jung notes that the maximum awareness that can be attained in life is had through reflecting on the dead as it is “the upper limit of knowledge to which the dead can attain” (*MDR* 311). More significantly, it is at the intersection between death and the living that higher attainment of the self may be achieved since “only here, in life on earth, where the opposites clash together, can the general level of consciousness be raised” (Jung, *MDR* 311). Such a crux juxtaposed between the past and the present make up a large understructure to the narration in “The Dead”.

A section of dialogue occurs in which Gabriel overhears the older members of the retinue, specifically Mr. Browne, discuss how the town of Dublin has changed as in relation to opera. It is commented on how radiant the voices were from the past and questions: “Why did they never play the grand old operas now?” (*D* 135). The conclusion reached is “[B]ecause they could not get the voices to sing them: that was why” (*D* 135) but not without adding, “I presume there are as good singers today as there were then” (*D* 135). The dialogue is to suggest a point-counterpoint with the present as compared to the long since past in which the time specific to the living have already encountered the finality of *death*.

While Jung has commented that when one has too many feelings as associated with the past it gives rise to sentimentality, this reflection in the narration is not one of pure sentimentality, rather to mark the change in Dublin and in the lives of the characters within the story as to give scope to the total encompass of time that extends beyond the characters within the setting. The aim thereof is to give pause and to reflect into the past as what can be learned

from it into the present as is the motif of *the dead*, those who have already passed and whose knowledge of passing in their own time is to shed light on a lesson for living.

3.3.1. “*Lean out of the window*”¹⁵

When the narrator looks through the window, it is actually a symbolic action that appeals to the archetype. It is the *self* examining itself, abiding by the actions that had taken place to individuate them according to the self’s own essence. The action of gazing into the window therefore should be understood as the narrator looking into himself or into his own version of his *self*, as antecedent his view into the window is the narrator’s own purview of the events prior to that action and the thoughts on them. It is this archetypal symbol of the window taken into context that it is easily interpreted as such within the *mythos* of the story. This image of the window is only one of many in the stories of *Dubliners*, and it could be understood as the place to *think* and *watch* the world. One way we can address to this recurring symbol is how distant the person on the inside can be from what they see outside, or how their *persona* rule over their *self*.

There are many instances throughout *Dubliners* of the protagonist examining an object from a window. “Eveline” opens with the protagonist “at the window watching the evening invade the avenue” (*D* 20). In “A Painful Case” the protagonist suddenly has a revelatory experience when “he read the paragraph again by the failing light of the window” (*D* 74). In “The Sisters”, the narrator struggles to understand the significance of events by associating the arrival of death as he “studied the lighted square of window” (*D* 1). At every instance of a window appearing it acts as a clear symbol of reflection into the self; i.e., as marker of the protagonist’s struggle with the conflict of the narrative – generally as a conflict with the self.

The window exists as a semi-transparent boundary which, much akin to the veil of death which separates the living from the dead, *Dubliners* makes frequent use of the symbol of the window and the motif of the dead in unison as to delineate the passage of one to the other.

In *Dubliners*, any instance of a protagonist waiting next to the window and examining the outside is noting a particular inactive nature, wherein the protagonist is examining the conflict of which they face but failing to actually take action to counter it. Moreover, the window also acts to limit the view and scope of the protagonist has on events. The window in symbolic use acts as

¹⁵ Joyce, *Chamber Music* V 1

a barrier between the protagonist and the setting (thereby the conflict of the narrative as well) of which one object is examined. While it should be noted that there are few instances in *Dubliners* of the window breaking or opening, but even these do not note activity but passivity. In “After the Race” the protagonist “threw open a window significantly” (*D* 27) after giving a toast, but he does not step outside or even put his head out, despite his desire to flee from his company. “The Boarding House” offers open windows with “lace curtains ballooned gently towards the street beneath the raised sashes” (*D* 39) but does not have a protagonist looking inward or outward of them, instead it is issued thematically as to enrich the setting of which escape from it is impossible wherein the observer looks into it and comprehends it as a prison jailing those inside.

As a room encapsulates an area separated into its own encompassment, a window into it is the demarcation between two areas of open and closed space, metaphorically easily tantamount to the self and the exterior to the self. The window in this regard is the veil between the two, of access to the internal and the external of the self in which they “symbolize the possibility of understanding and of passing through to the external and the beyond, and are also an illustration of any idea of communication” (Cirlot 274). Furthermore, the room itself is an easily associable with an area of consciousness of which the window looks back into “since it consists of an aperture, the window expresses the ideas of penetration, of possibility and of distance” (Cirlot 373-4). As a consequence, it can be seen that these instances are not coincidental within the text but aim at a common purpose in which the self receives examination as per the motif of *paralysis*.

Gabriel, perhaps more than any other character in “The Dead” expresses this concept of consciousness examination. Though he is frequently found to either gaze or look out of windows, there are three times which seem most pertinent to the concept of the self.

Firstly, as to note again that Gabriel’s paralysis is one in which he is unable to comprehend others and therefore unable to comprehend himself. Even though immersed by surroundings rich in a supporting cast of characters, he is unable, try as he might, to make an actual connection with them. This is laid out in the outset in which he tries to offer money to Lily, the caretaker’s daughter, who refuses it, he merely justifying that it is Christmas, not seeming to comprehend any reason to do so beyond the customary exchange. This later will be mirrored by his wife when he questions her sobbing.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

When Gabriel wishes to abscond, Joyce has the character frequently look out of a window and would appear to remind himself and the reader of the stark difference cast in the setting, as well as the conflict between Gabriel and himself. When he first does so, it is preceded by his disagreement as to travel to Western Ireland as suggested by Miss Ivors, which is enthusiastically resounded by his wife, to which he gives a flat out refusal. This exchange of dialogue is meant to presage the final window allusion in the story in which he spiritually travels over western Ireland in self-reflection and revelation. It also symbolizes his unwillingness to actually do any action, as subject to paralysis – which is why there is mention of Mrs. Malins recounted tale of fishing and enjoyment, which is distinctly lacking in Gabriel. Instead, up to this point, Joyce has distinctly focused on Gabriel’s distance from others even in spite of the overtly congenial setting, but when Gabriel finds himself at the window, it offers a moment of self-reflection in which it is clear that, as a protagonist, he is in conflict with himself as to establish association with the others as well as with himself. Instead of finding more of an identity with the setting and characters as presented, he forcefully isolates himself.

When Gabriel approaches the window he does so in such a manner as to distinctly touch the glass as if trying to escape: “Gabriel's warm trembling fingers tapped the cold pane of the window. How cool it must be outside! How pleasant it would be to walk out alone, first along by the river and then through the park!” (*D* 130)

The cold is used here to symbolically provide contrast to the warmth of the party and the camaraderie with others that Gabriel shuns. The association with the cold also is one of freedom for Gabriel, in which its promise to liberate him from the self-conflictive nature is shown. The window in Gabriel’s instance also is to symbolize an unstarted journey of which Gabriel, much like the other characters of *Dubliners*, is prone to. Though he can view an extension of liberation from his paralytic nature whereby absconding from the party would at the very least be an action taken on his part, he does nothing but pine for release and virtually hides his emotions and true feelings from almost all, save the reader and Miss Ivors.

Greta’s sabotage is presaged by her own allusion to glancing out of the window. After dinner, in a cab, on their way to a hotel: “She [Gretta] was looking out of the window and seemed tired” (*D* 146). As with Gabriel, where the window marks reflection into himself and into his paralysis of identity, Gretta glances out of the window in her own quiet desperation, however here belies her own paralysis in which she maintains a hidden nature to both reader and

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

story, which, when revealed, changes the nature of the story and characters around her. This is due to the fact that when her visage through the window is mentioned, it is not of a similar paralyzed nature, but one in which she must hide the totality of herself, knowing herself better than the other characters throughout *Dubliners*, though not admitting so. In this regard, the relationship she possess to the window is one of hidden knowledge or information, which, when possessed, changes the protagonist. She does not look for the window to escape but to look into herself. Consequent is Gabriel's shift in character at the end of the text in which he is no longer of an uncertain or anxious nature when he is exposed to this inner knowledge. Note when entering the hotel room, after struggling so much with his overcoat throughout the story, that Gabriel "threw his overcoat and hat on a couch and crossed the room towards the window. He looked down into the street in order that his emotion might calm a little" (*D* 147). This anxiety is brought on after walking through the street with her to the boarding house in which he guiltily asks himself why he cannot express his true feelings to her, mirroring his inability to speak in general out of a paralysis of identifying his own self with that of the other. Despite even his desire "to be alone with her" (*D* 145) in order that he may be openly affectionate with her in open words, he cannot speak. Indeed, he is afraid to on the street as is mentioned that "[H]e was glad of its rattling noise as it saved him from conversation" (*D* 146). This very anxiousness of which he again fantasizes to escape into the open is calmed by the window as his nature is viewed alone as that of a person wholly uncomfortable with themselves and unable to change their actions.

Contrary to Gabriel is Gretta, whom the reader only knows through Gabriel prior to her own admissions within the hotel room. It would seem that Joyce has purposefully tricked the reader into thinking that they know a general truth of the character, but, ultimately, do not with the revelation of Gretta's secrets.

When Gretta joins Gabriel at the window (*D* 147), Gabriel has his moment to talk to her. First he asks mundane questions of how she feels without following up any answer, then, instead of a grand romantic gesture, he merely mentions of Malins who "gave me [him] back that sovereign I [he] lent him" (*D* 148).

Gretta and Gabriel in this essence fit the archetype of the *anima* and *animus* in which, much as in the yin-yang symbol of constant change and correspondence, mutually lack what the other has. Gretta is mute to other in her feelings and self, but is honest silently, while Gabriel is

vocal in all but what he really thinks, essentially a speaker of platitudes, but never the truth and especially never to himself. When he does manage to kiss her, these two corresponding archetypes change places as for one to absorb the protagonist status from the other as to complement each other's own narratives.

After the revelation, Gabriel holds her hand as symbol to archetypal experience of gaining secret knowledge which thereafter changes his view of the world as well as the narration, but yet again he returns to the window, but this time, he has no desire to abscond outwards but internalizes the revelation: "Gabriel held her hand for a moment longer, irresolutely, and then, shy of intruding on her grief, let it fall gently and walked quietly to the window" (*D* 151).

Jung notes that the story's internalization allows for an equal mythologization to occur, in which the unconscious, or that which is known but revealed, transmogrifies into that which is known, and thereby, an epiphany to occur which changes the nature of the self in the process. "Myth is the natural and indispensable intermediate stage between unconscious and conscious cognition. True, the unconscious knows more than consciousness does; but it is knowledge of a special sort, knowledge in eternity, usually without reference to the here and now, not couched in language of the intellect" (Jung, *MDR* 311).

What comes to conscious light from the unconscious also changes the character through the internalization of the self, as shown as Gretta's knowledge transforms Gabriel into a protagonist who, at the very least, addresses his paralysis.

3.3.2. (Im)Possible Reconciliation of a Journey Westward

Gabriel refuses to associate his wife with western Ireland, with that of Connacht, as it symbolizes his inability to associate with the Irish people. He views himself above them, much like Joyce as his wife Nora Barnacle is from the same region. Clearly, Joyce is trying to speak about the paralysis among the intellectual class of Ireland to associate themselves with the Irish in which they cannot associate that which has value with Ireland as they view it as being too paralytic for their tastes, even if it paralyses them in their own national identity.

The dialogue with Miss Ivors is to specifically highlight Gabriel's plight in his conflict of dissociation with Ireland and the Irish. When she asks, "'She's [his wife Gretta] from Connacht, isn't she?'" (*D* 128), no words are minced and Gabriel curtly replies: "'Her people are'" (*D* 128),

which notes the attitude of the protagonist to his own identity as being the conflict, paralyzed by it. Oddly, such rejection is clearly abandoned by Miss Ivors. She parallels Gabriel as the *anima* to the *animus*, as she is equally comfortable with her Irish heritage but is also an academic, albeit slightly askew and discrete as compare to Gabriel. Though Gabriel would suspect that no one read his review in a so-called protestant journal, it appears that Miss Ivors has, even approving of it. The dialogue that occurs in their waltz (itself symbolic of the motif of the *animus* and the *anima* interacting on the self) generate a discourse of which Gabriel's conflict comes to light. Gabriel awkwardly declines a suggestion of holidaying in the countryside of Ireland, instead insisting that "we [he and his wife] usually go to France or Belgium or perhaps Germany" (*D* 128). But he is unable to provide an answer as to exactly why it should be so that he shall not visit other parts of Ireland, perhaps as to "keep in touch with the languages" (*D* 128). But, it is revealed, as Joyce is opt to point out that the alienation of his character to his homeland is evidenced by his inability to even speak Irish. Gabriel even says directly that "Irish is not my language" (*D* 129). Ultimately, the conflict comes to a head and when the question is asked of Gabriel if "haven't you your own land to visit" (*D* 129), or "that you know nothing of, your own people, and your own country?" (*D* 129). Gabriel shouts out, "I'm sick of my own country, sick of it!" (*D* 129), to which he can provide no answer as to why he has totally disassociated from it and is paralyzed to make any connection between himself and Ireland, as well as to even question it in its very nature.

The dialogue itself finishes with Miss Ivors: "Of course, you've no answer" (*D* 129) as directed to the reader to show that the paralysis experienced in Gabriel's case of self-alienation is reasonless, much as in the other cases of paralysis in which the true nature of it serves no purpose other than the paralysis itself.

Moreover, the irony is that Gabriel clearly is named for the archangel Gabriel, who, according to Catholic tradition, is the messenger of God. Here, Gabriel feels empowered to bring upon a message exacting truth among his family and friends yet is unable to bring himself to do so and finds himself mute in the fact. More evident is the irony as this is likely a celebration marking either the epiphany or twelfth night as leading up to a epiphany or realization in which Gabriel struggles with himself as to be able to not announce epiphany to others, but in the end, ultimately reaching his own.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

The parallel between Gabriel and the archangel as messenger is also apparent in the moment prior to delivering his speech to the party guests in which he again imagines himself in a moment of liberation outside of the party:

Gabriel leaned his ten trembling fingers on the tablecloth and smiled nervously at the company. Meeting a row of upturned faces he raised his eyes to the chandelier. ... People, perhaps, were standing in the snow on the quay outside, gazing up at the lighted windows and listening to the waltz music. The air was pure there. In the distance lay the park where the trees were weighted with snow. The Wellington Monument wore a gleaming cap of snow that flashed westward over the white field of Fifteen Acres. (*D* 137)

Gabriel creates an imaginary audience for himself as if he were the archangel announcing the birth of Christ to shepherds in the field, wherein the snow topped monument is symbolic of the star of Bethlehem. Here the window allows a transmission from the outside world to the inside—even if it's only an allusion. It is clear, by this parallel, however, that the archetypal experience of “The Dead” is an underlying nature between self knowledge and revelation. Gabriel is motivated to impart wisdom as to change those around him, but finds himself ironically mute; yet, at the end of the story, epiphany is reached through his wife's words who has remained silent for the majority of the story, allowing Gabriel to bridge his paralysis and the revelatory epiphany he would like to others to go through, but not himself.

That the setting of the story be placed upon the night of epiphany is fitting for the theme, as Gabriel “comes face to face with his predecessor and with his own self, with the past that has claimed all the others and the future that he has betrayed in order to maintain his comfortable position on the outside” (Benstock, “The Dead” 58). Gabriel can no longer claim to be an outsider, as he envisions the snow falling over western Ireland, he also accepts it as falling over him as well. The archetype of the self in this manner has made a journey as to recognize that which is outside of it and to incorporate it into the self. This also encompasses Gabriel's acceptance of his own heritage and incorporates the ancestry of Ireland as his conflict with himself as belonging to the people of the Irish nation has received recompense. However, this is done in such a manner that Gabriel finds himself to be as prone to ignorance and paralysis as

those of the others from which he had once excluded himself. In this instance, the story fits the motif of *the self* transforming into *the other*.

Gabriel's recognition of his own faults, in the self-recognition of his ignorance, is contrary to all other stories within *Dubliners* as progression within the development of the character is present. However, the motif of *paralysis* is still unbroken as the story addresses Gabriel's apparent long-standing inability to recognize the archetype of *the other* as correlating with the archetype of *the self*. The conclusion within the gnomonic nature of the story is also ambiguous as to address the future development of the character. As opposed to other protagonists within the collection, who are reliably seen to return to their paralysis, Gabriel may or may not recognize his freedom from it. In the penultimate paragraph, there is an acceptance of "the other" from which Gabriel willingly separates himself. However, this also means a loss of the self being incorporated into the other, necessitating a creation of a new identity at the expense of a loss of the old one. This is termed in the sentence: "His own identity was fading out into a grey impalpable world" (*D* 152). The ambiguity remains, nonetheless, as to what will be of Gabriel. Though he reaches an epiphany, he is now challenged as to apply it to the self, confronting it in spite of the world which is grey and subject to the motif of paralysis. Without provided reconciliation or conclusion, it is vague as to whether Gabriel will take the steps necessary to complete a journey of self-discovery as only he "must begin the quest ... to arrive at the real epiphany, to follow his star. After many false starts of self-deception" (Benstock, "The Dead" 58). The doubt is evidenced even further as, in the dark of the room, Gabriel's epiphany of admiration of his wife is still partial, implying that this is an incomplete recognition which may lead to a paralysis/ignorance or to his salvation - the gnomon here is imprecise and open to interpretation. Despite the certainty, however, of Gabriel's future, the paralysis and recognition are clear.¹⁶

The archetype of *the saboteur*, a character or event that disturbs the *status quo* as order is embodied by that of Greta, who, in spite of featuring such a lowly role in the story, comes to be its focus at the end. Gabriel, so dismissive of her that little dialogue or mention is supplied to her

¹⁶ The opaqueness as to the ending of "The Dead" has been erstwhile mentioned. Walzl has noted that the story is shaded as either revelatory when read alone or a finalization to the motif of paralysis when read as a conclusion that tops off the collection: "The context in which 'The Dead' is read affects interpretations of the story. For the reader who approaches 'The Dead' by way of the preceding fourteenth stories of frustrations, inaction and moral paralysis, this story is likely to seem a completion of these motifs, and Gabriel's epiphany a recognition that he is a dead member of a dead society. But when 'The Dead' is read as a short story unrelated to *Dubliners*, the effect is different: the story seems one of spiritual development and the final vision a redemption" (17).

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

in the story without direct reference to him, suddenly becomes a character in her own right, who shares more depth of a character than even Gabriel does as there are no limits expressed explicitly as in Gabriel's case into her character. Albeit, the deluge of her at the end only acts as that of the saboteur who disrupts the decided nature to which Gabriel had arrived at prior to the revelation of her own existence that had be unbeknownst to him, she liberates him from his self-imprisoned ideology of alienation and reflection into the self.

Much as *Dubliners* opens with a deluge into a window, of a limited narrator looking inward, it also ends with a limited narrator looking outward. While the initial onset of the use of the symbol is to invite the reader into the examination of the archetype of the self, the end is of the self looking onto in a moment of epiphany that suggests understanding and recognition, as well as internalization. The change in Gabriel's character is again marked by an approach to a window wherein "a few light taps upon the pane made him turn to the window. It had begun to snow again" (*D* 152). As opposed to "The Sisters" in which the narrator and reader is perplexed as to the nature of the event, Gabriel has received a moment of *claritas* which allows for his thereto character composition to begin a transformation, thus executed against *paralysis*. His wife's revelation of secrets engages the protagonist and reader as to reexamine what is provided to be *true* to the reader as it would appear that the knowledge known of the setting and character is limited, and which can be changed, given an epiphanic insertion, as fitting her character's *saboteur* status. Indicated specifically by the symbol of the snow, which is not only utilized as a mechanism to represent the cold inaction of *paralysis* throughout the story, but as well as a metaphor for the blanket of Irish nationality which affects Gabriel despite his rejections, it is obvious that Gabriel has progressed as a character. When it is concluded that "the time had come for him to set out on his journey westward" (*D* 152), marks Gabriel's internalization of revelation for his Irish identity, i.e., the standardized archetypal experience of *transformation of the self*. Joyce even specifically brings in the mention of Irish nationality and ancestry into the final lines: "Yes, the newspapers were right: snow was general all over Ireland. ... It was falling, too, upon every part of the lonely churchyard on the hill where Michael Furey lay buried. ... upon all the living and the dead" (*D* 152), to mark that Gabriel has found an identity within the Irish nation, in spite of his misgivings. He has grown out of Ireland and is a product of his own nationality, contrary to his thoughts. This also tangentially reveals that Gabriel found himself mute as to give a speech as his constructed identity had acted as a barrier between *the self* and

identity. By denying his Irishness, he was also unable to speak the truth to them. Thereby, doubt is also cast on the stories prior to “The Dead” as their respective *paralysis* may also come into question given the same unexpected revelatory turn of which their stories were not part to.

3.4. “A Painful Case” – Mr. Duffy as Gabriel’s Counterpoint

“A Painful Case” shows the opposite of Gabriel’s experience in which the knowledge gained does not transfer to the protagonist. While the protagonist is confronted with their flaws, little changes at all in their character. Instead of the self coming to recognize the *anima/animus* concept of the other in which the character of Mrs. Sinico had represented, Mr. Duffy, the protagonist, seems to be left confronted but unable to understand what has happened. While he suffers from the same flaw Gabriel does, of being unable to relate to those around him, Mr. Duffy is unable at all to share or partake in life with others (this is also similarly contrasted with Jimmy in “After the Race”, who is isolated in his own thoughts despite always being in company or in a party). Much like the other protagonists, Duffy’s standoffish nature relegates him to a paralysis of the self and a concept of loneliness in which the importance of maintaining his self-identity uninterrupted trumps that of all other needs. However, upon meeting Mrs. Sinico, his self is shaken considerably. She represents the *anima* to his *animus*, as with Gabriel and Gretta, in which her *self* is not paralyzed by loneliness and is able to connect with another. The bridge by which they are both able to connect or exchange the secret knowledge is their love of opera and literature, but Mr. Duffy, despite the transformation that Mrs. Sinico offers, remains unchanged and unable to see the epiphany that is clear to the reader – the self-isolation he makes of himself into a *hermit*.

Duffy justifies his isolation through the explanation that “every bond ... is a bond to sorrow” (*D* 73). Through these words, his character flaw is seen, of which he purposefully separates himself from others, much as Gabriel does. However, Duffy does so in order to maintain his self-identity, unable to bond it with others or to allow it to transmorph as it encounters new knowledge. Gabriel lacks this distinct hurdle to overcome his flaws. He is interested in engaging others but not admitting his own identity to himself. Duffy is very much aware of his self, thereby seeking isolation. As opposed to Gabriel, Duffy is not even interested in communicating with others. Both, he (and Gabriel) fit the archetype of the outcast. When

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Duffy is confronted with a moment of epiphany, he crafts no new knowledge of it, but sees it as evidence of his already held views. When addressing Mrs. Sinico's death and the love he had for her, he does admit his love but confirms his prejudice of every bond bringing pain. Note in particular how Joyce utilizes the word "venal" of the body or of a physical nature, to specifically draw attention to the corporeal nature of the deed: "Those venal and furtive loves filled him with despair. He gnawed the rectitude of his life; he felt that he had been outcast from life's feast" (*D* 77). Joyce may use "venal" here as to denote that Mr. Duffy also is of the archetype of the corrupted religious man who is blinded to world due to an obsession of that which is held holy to him. This is a common theme in Joyce's work, of the individual who thinks that they have achieved salvation but is mistaken and have actually been corrupted. This also mirrors the simony of purity and corruption as seen throughout *Dubliners*. Duffy is also a hermit which is similar but contrary to archetypical motif of the monk.

When the epitaph of Mrs. Sinico is completed within the text, the narrative switches back to Mr. Duffy and his limited omniscience as a narrator upon which he starts to reflect upon the event proper. The shift in style is not merely evident from the journalistic to fictional prose, but it is clear that the remainder of the text becomes painted through the jaded views of Mr. Duffy, in which he ultimately rejects any epiphany of emotion that would otherwise follow but forges one for himself reaffirming his isolation. Here Joyce utilizes the window again as symbol in which an epiphany is present but fully incomprehensible due to the paralysis of the protagonist. Note how Joyce leaves the setting to be without emotion reflecting the somber mood of Duffy: "Mr. Duffy raised his eyes from the paper and gazed out of his window on the cheerless evening landscape" (*D* 75).

From here Joyce delves into the protagonist, constructing the narrative to be unquestionably clear as to the fact that it is Mr. Duffy's denial of his own emotion outright is both the cause and, according to Duffy, the solution to his isolation despite the darkening aspect to which the conclusion of the story abandons him in. Opening with, "[W]hat an end!" (*D* 75), which alludes to not only to the narrative but to himself, he argues (to reaffirm to his self/*animus*) the whole affair to be a testament to his self-imposed isolation. Each sentence itself is a reiteration between the personality of *the self* and a rejection of the external.

Drawing upon the *paralysis* motif, Joyce creates a demarcation that undulates between the establishment of the profane nature of the self and the sacred, which is ultimately rejected.

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

Mr. Duffy expresses utter revulsion, but not at the event of Mrs. Sinico's death but that she may have dragged him out of his supposed divine sanctity of hermitage into the reflection of his existence of solitude. "The whole narrative of her death revolted him and it revolted him to think that he had ever spoken to her of what he held sacred" (*D* 75). The monologue of the character belies his true motive, in which it is established that the relationship between the protagonist and the supposed standard love interest had not been that which was presented, but rather an allegory of the incapability to establish one's identity with another. Gabriel lacks this specific flaw, which is his ultimate saving grace, but Duffy is a warning. The reader may be aware that the characters of Mrs. Sinico and Mr. Duffy act in a platonic love story, but Joyce twists this around by painting a much darker and insalubrious picture of a morality tale of one being unable to overcome their own imposed identity in order to experience that which is warranted by their actual desires or needs. Note how Joyce utilizes the words of "miserable and malodorous" to characterize the view of Mrs. Sinico, "[H]is [Duffy's] soul's companion!" (*D* 75), only after the fact.

Mr. Duffy, despite the seemingly straightforward nature of the character, is complex. Joyce portrays him as a tragic character who knows of their own tragic flaw but fails to act on it. This fact is not dissimilar from the other characters and motifs of *Dubliners*, especially when reading "Grace", which concludes in all characters jointly and separately justifying their paralysis while being painfully aware of and even admitting to the issue causing it. A specific passage is included to highlight the nature of Duffy's isolated self, which is to make apparent that the character is neither happy either being separated and alone, nor in relation to having an established connection to another; i.e., the character is caught in *medias res* in a surmounting conflict. Joyce writes out through the voice of Mr. Duffy that "love between man and man is impossible because there must not be sexual intercourse and friendship between man and woman is impossible because there must be sexual intercourse" (*D* 73).

Characteristically of Mr. Duffy, as is par for course concerning the protagonists of *Dubliners*, he is torn between two options, yet neither is capable of being met. This passage also paints the true motive of the character despite machinations later listed contrary to it: he wishes to be loved and not alone, but is unable to. It is also important to underscore the fact that Joyce transforms the character as being unable to partake in the same joys as prior, noting "[H]e kept

*DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY*

away from concerts lest he should meet her” (D 73) to demonstrate the shift in character but a lack of resolution, as returning to the paralysis motif.

Mr. Duffy, in spite of this semi-self-admittance, is consumed by his need of solitude to such a drastic degree as to keep sacred that which he regards as so easily corruptible. It is evident, tragically, to all but the protagonist, that his simony of trying to maintain that which he thinks is sacred through sheer isolation is that which drives his character to be a tragic one, as his perception of his persevered self-identity, makes him paralyzed. This is further shown by the fact that Mr. Duffy regularly regards the mere contact with Mrs. Sinico as a transgression against it, of which may have leveled his identity against her, risking change: “But that she could have sunk so low! Was it possible he had deceived himself so utterly about her? (D 76). This sardonic and parodied experience of a *fall from grace* underscores Duffy’s isolation as he is the one who casts her from his graces in order to for his self-isolation, but, by doing so, he himself falls from the grace supplied by the existence of her *animus* shining light on the *anima* of self-imposed isolation. Joyce uses Duffy’s voice to reinforce the tragedy implied, wherein Duffy repeats assertions in support of his decision, shading memories of the past in his decisions of the present moment: “He remembered her outburst of that night and interpreted it in a harsher sense than he had ever done. He had no difficulty now in approving of the course he had taken” (D 76). Joyce underscores repeatedly the unwavering nature of Duffy as a character who stands as a metaphor for isolation and the failure of the self to recognize what it lacks and what completes it. (Duffy here is similar to Maria from “Clay” in which she is presented as standoffish to interaction with possible male suitors even though it clearly implied as the drive of the character). Mrs. Sinico is opposite; her character compliments that of Duffy as a device in order to provide revelation and change to the character. Joyce stymies the reader, however, by ending the action before it starts to showcase this very nature of character *paralysis* within the plot of the story.

Joyce seems to have made the character of Duffy as one that presents a self-awareness of his misery but chooses, as throughout *Dubliners*, to also paint the picture of a character who rejects any revelation or epiphany that would otherwise bring about resolution to the character; more specifically, one which would change the essence of the character. Instead, these stories offer confirmation and abruptly end the character development. This fact is further evidenced by Phoenix Park as being the setting in which Joyce chooses to not have the character “reborn” (to use the metaphoric turn of phrase), but to have a self-discourse in which Duffy expunges the

benefits of being alone. The double-edged beauty of the work is that Duffy's striving to be alone, his motivation as a protagonist hidden under the surface of pretension as an ascetic way of life, leads him to accomplishing his aim as a protagonist; his mission is fulfilled which, while satisfying the line of action in the plot as providing a conclusion to Duffy's end, also leaves an acute lack of character development. In simpler words, the desire of abject isolation, as has been sought, is met but somehow the story leaves the character as undeveloped in the sense that no resolution has occurred except that the character's flaw has progressed.

When examined, it is evident that Joyce intends such an interpretation as the concluding paragraph asserts the withdrawal of the protagonist into isolation through the metaphor of darkness as accompanied by silence. This fact is furthered when one takes into consideration that the counter position of Duffy is laid out by Sinico as *yin* to *yang/anima* to *animus* in which her voice which had called him out of isolation is silenced and the metaphoric light she had brought into his life is darkened: "He could not feel her near him in the darkness nor her voice touch his ear. He waited for some minutes listening. He could hear nothing: the night was perfectly silent. He listened again: perfectly silent. He felt that he was alone" (*D* 77).

Tindall takes up the same view that Duffy's isolation is inherently opposed to that of Mrs. Sinico's embrace of the other as to pose a point-counterpoint development within the plot and character structure. Tindall claims though that "Mr. Duffy's deadly sin is pride or, as Freud puts it, ego" (*Guide to James Joyce* 32). This statement does not detract from the motive of the character as seeking isolation as Duffy's fictional ego is too engrossed in itself to establish a balance between the self and the other (between the *anima* and *animus*). Tindall goes on to state that "[M]rs. Sinico's virtue is charity or, as Lawrence puts it, love" (*Guide to James Joyce* 32). This personification of character is directly counterpoised to Duffy. From an analysis of the two of which the characters offer both a hypothesis and antithesis, a synthesis is found where "'communion' is the important word of the first part [of 'A Painful Case'], so 'touch' and 'alone' are the important words of the last" (Tindall, *Guide to James Joyce* 32).

Duffy is written as a character whose range is limited from submitting to another, whether this be from pride, ego, or self-imposed isolation, need not matter. The embodiment of inability to branch out from the extreme is apparent in that he even knows of the transformative power of an embrace to Mrs. Sinico would have, but relegates it to the realm of impossibility: "One human being had seemed to love him and he had denied her life and happiness: he had

sentenced her to ignominy, a death of shame” (D 77). From this exact well of despair, however, Joyce draws upon the allegory of being consumed by oneself as a means of being saved from the conflict of character with the self or between *the anima* and *the animus*.

It is therefore clear that the actual hidden plot line between the two characters is one in which it is otherwise expected that the protagonist will correct their “sin” and, through the interaction presented in plot, emerge as a different character at the end. Joyce is so bold as to create characters such as Duffy that defy this typification of narrative and character, but emerge as fulfilling their motive nonetheless. Such is *Dubliners* in all of its characters and forms.

3.5. The Irish Shadow of a Moral History

Though its pages may be short, the length of the book is betrayed by *Dubliners* powerful message. Its stories are rich in archetypal images and characters, which portray the *paralysis* of many actions taken and not taken. Still, *Dubliners* epitomizes a traditional narrative, where Joyce’s prose style remains richly plain (naturalistic) and in service of his (earlier) poetic and rhythmic endeavors. But one should have in mind that here, Joyce creates and establishes his characters, themes, and images, giving them purpose and a supplementary role in other texts that he was to write later in his career, whether in constructing the symbolic or narrative function. Lenehan from “Two Gallants” and Bob Doran from “The Boarding House”, for instance, reappear in his later books. The subject of Ireland as a paralytic state is also a common theme in his later works, where he portrays the same haphazard of the community through Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom.

The aspect of *paralysis* and using it as a motif to color, shade, and mark every nook and cranny of the proverbial souls of the characters is the common theme. Through the use of an archetypal approach, especially in this motif form, the *paralysis* itself is presented to the reader as a *gnomon* of apparent intersecting lines on an incomplete chart. The *simony*, generally pursued by the protagonists, is seen as their objective goals, but it is only a profanity sought in place of the sacred. The triumvirate of these aspects together forms the Jungian shadow which surfaces to the reader throughout examining the character’s inability to transform him or herself.

Bearing this concept of the shadow in mind, *Dubliners* is easy to understand as a comprehensive whole which is bookended by death as both the event and concept. James Joyce’s

***DUBLINERS: A BOOK OF DESPAIR THROUGH THE PORTRAYAL OF
PARALYSIS, GNOMON, AND SIMONY***

Dubliners therefore is not a disparate endeavor of individual episodes, rather aggregates fifteen short stories to assemble a whole when read together, but are still able to stand alone when read apart. Albeit various in their reflections, each follows one main character as they are propelled through an existence that mirrors actuality and a compulsion onwards by the events these characters find themselves in, yet helpless to act, caught in a paralytic existence of their own making, frequently lost in their misguided thoughts. However, this lack of inertia does not take away from the rich humanity and experience the characters portend.

The stories themselves do not necessarily lack closure, as the reader is capable of drawing his or her own conclusions on the gnostic basis. If there is any revelation, it is in the mind of the reader who is able to connect the lines together to form a whole shape. While Gabriel does see the error in his ways, it cannot be certain that his epiphany has freed him, as it concludes the collection. It therefore may be seen only as partial, as the results of the epiphany are not given, unlike in Joyce's other works. Therein, for the sake of introduction to the next "study in epiphany" let it suffice to quote Tindall and finish the "study in paralysis" concurring that "[E]ach story ... may be thought of as a great epiphany and the container of little epiphanies, an epiphany of epiphanies" (*Guide to James Joyce* 11).

4. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: Character Progression through Epiphany – “an element in all human experience”*¹⁷

4.1. *Escaping Paralysis through Epiphany*

A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man is a semi-autobiographical novel. Divided into five chapters this work details events which closely correspond with those of Joyce’s first twenty years. Stephen Daedalus is both, the protagonist of the novel, as well as the mask behind which Joyce paints his fictional portrait of *the artist* and of *the young man*. What particularly sets this novel apart from the other *bildungsroman* novels is Joyce’s manipulation of the narrative itself – the language and syntax used at each point in the book reflect the age and intellectual development of Stephen at that time. *A Portrait* is one of the earlier examples in English literature of a novel that makes extensive use of epiphany¹⁸. By using this technique rather than just describing Stephen’s feelings from an external position, the reader is better able to connect to and identify with Stephen. We are essentially given a window into Stephen’s (un)consciousness, through which the whole world is unveiled by a single aperture.

As has been noted that the main theme of *Dubliners* is an expressed dearth of character development in spite of conflict, the main theme of *A Portrait* is how the character does change in spite of repeatedly facing conflicts. As an accumulation of individual snapshots of character flaws, *Dubliners* thoroughly addresses the concept of a character as intentionally written to be suppressed and deprived of development. In contrast, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* sets out to provide a polar opposite in these terms of focusing on character. The novel delves into one specific character, covering his development out of a *paralytic* form, in a tone which is freed from conflicts presented situationally to the plot, whose internalization is examined by means of the narration through the protagonist’s eyes. As opposed to *Dubliners*, in

¹⁷ Beja, *Epiphany in the Modern Novel* 80, emphasis added.

¹⁸ Joyce’s three years younger brother, Stanislaus, in *My Brother’s Keeper* give as a look into Joyce’s notion of the concept of epiphany. Stanislaus writes that “[A]nother experimental form which his [Joyce’s] literary urge took ... consisted in the noting of what he called ‘epiphanies’ – manifestations or revelations. Jim always had a contempt for secrecy, and these notes were in the beginning ironical observations of slips, and little errors and gestures – mere straws in the wind – by which people betrayed the very things they were most careful to conceal. Epiphanies were always brief sketches, hardly ever more than some dozen lines in length, but always very accurately observed and noted, the matter being so slight” (124-5).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

which conclusions to the characters fall upon deaf ears to all but the reader, Joyce chooses to construct a more thorough examination which takes the protagonist of Stephen Dedalus upon a journey of bridging points to which the final revelatory experience is realized, but still no conclusion beyond a liberation of the self, to the character is provided as the novel is open ended. Joyce, as a narrative means to construct this line of action that spans the novel, utilizes the literary epiphany in order to develop the character. While the protagonist faces conflicts and confronts their own flaws, it is not a singular or direct path that they take, but a meandering one that leads to a final result. The character comes into a new being which is not at all apparent in the outset.

Yet, the milestones on this journey are the epiphanies of which Joyce employs for the character to reflect, in which the flaws of the character and the conflict may be brought to light which are then addressed philosophically through self-dialogue and self-epiphany.

Again, in this same manner, Joyce is writing with an aim toward *claritas* (in the novel as *radiancy*) of that which is hidden becomes seen and known. Stephen Dedalus, in this regard, serves as a character that reacts to the unveiling of secret knowledge as an active transformation through an individuation of circumstance, upon whose reflection transverses a string of situations that transform the character along an overreaching arc.

4.2. Joyce and Aquinas Integrated in Epiphany

In spite of *A Portrait* as an assemblage of epiphanies, it does lead to an ultimate conclusion of the protagonist escaping pitfalls, which would otherwise trap him to emerge as a *non-paralyzed* character, the immediate release from paralysis is not entirely evident nor the direction which the character shall take. While the epiphany is used as a narrative device, it is also used in terms of action as to compel the character onward through the plot. When one epiphany occurs, it may be ultimately a false epiphany which is replaced by another or lead to another, of which a true *claritas* emerges. Moreover, as Jung and Campbell would note, the epiphany is the initial step giving access to secret information, which, when internalized, the character uses to overcome further obstacles that shall be encountered in their journey – this is when a moment of *claritas* is reached. Alongside the epiphany, Joyce utilizes this method as to

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

mythologize the character to show the progression in the context of a wider story in which the knowledge of the *claritas* allows him (or her) access to the escape, as through the progression and development of the character.

Joyce here is incorporating the aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas within the epiphany as a usage for narrative conscious. However, the three congruent aspects of *integritas*, *consonantia*, and *claritas* are not tantamount to the concept of comprehending the illumination of “art” rather that of epiphany as it changes the individual’s conscious upon reflection of the event or object. Whereas Aquinas utilizes these as aesthetic terms in the understanding of metaphysical substance as well as the appreciation of the beautiful and the sublime, Joyce, as through the understanding of Stephen Dedalus, utilizes these as terms of discovery, as per a psychological stance, as a means to the truth as interpreted in these meanings. To wit, the epiphanies take on extended archetypal significance as well which address established associations by way of archetypal symbolism, metaphor, and motif.

Integritas is understood by Aquinas as the object in and of itself as devoid of outside association as it is *per se*. The object as it stands alone is merely that which receives the focus, but as such gives rise to both *consonantia* and *claritas* based upon its object nature. Campbell deems this term as “what is within the frame” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 25) as it is taken alone and exclusive to the other. *Inetegritas* is termed as *wholeness* by Joyce. The essential difference between the two uses is that while Aquinian interpretation is to draw a line between the physical nature and the aesthetic as they are not one, Joyce utilizes this term as translated as *wholeness* to address the nature of the object that gives rise to the comprehension of it as being part of one totality to which the *radiance* emerges.

Claritas, in Aquinian terms, sets to establish a definition of the state of emotion upon which the revelation of beauty, either through beauty itself or the sublime, as what would today be deemed psychological, occurs separate from the actual object; i.e., the object itself bears no meaning beyond the interpretation of beauty, in which the latter and not the object is transcendent. Joyce, in his use of *radiance*, claims the term to be one of a means of transcendence in which the totality of *wholeness*, *harmony*, and *radiance* transcends the physical being of the object and drives a sense of transcendence in its psychological aspects, or, in narrative terms, *radiance* motivates the character as in a retrospective form originating from the outcome in which the revelation transforms the character by the conclusion in the realization,

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

comprehension, and interpretation of the event/object. Michael Sayeau, in his study on modernist narrative – *Against the Event*, draws out Joyce’s artistic strategies and provides us with the notion of “the event” in Joyce’s plot. According to Sayeau, that is the “one that emerges through the avoidance or even cancellation of the conventional literary models of the event – and the literary forms that bear it” (190). To clarify this even further, Sayeau remarks that “while this modified, ‘anti-evental’ event bears some similarities to the philosophical concepts ... it more importantly points toward a provocatively different model of event, the subjects involved in it, and the meaning of the complex as a whole” (190).

Consonantia in Aquinian terms deals functionally with the distance between the object and beauty, particularly in regards to the object as in connection to the other, *vis-à-vis* the totality of creation. Joyce though removes this from a theological totality of the homogeneity of grace to be viewed as a “rhythm of beauty” in which the corresponding parts establish the whole and the whole does not establish the corresponding parts. Campbell notes that “the arrangement of forms in relationship to each other: part to part, each part to the whole, and the whole to each of its parts” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 25).

Joyce addends the Aquinas concept of the comprehension of the aesthetic as to establish a means by which the totality of all may be incorporative into one and in which *art* or *aesthetics* in and of themselves motivate the protagonist Stephen as to liberate himself. The driving nature of finding “unknown arts” is coming to terms with the *radiance/claritas* of the individual *vis-à-vis* an exploration and comprehension of the self. As *A Portrait* so deems it, it is the evolution of the boy into the artist and finding a recognition within it that radiates onto his own life. Joyce needs to redefine Aquinas’ terms for this very reason as the story is one that incorporates the whole even when the art is exterior to the artist. True, it is still a matter of interpretation that has no meaning beyond that which is subject to the circumstance of the interpretation; however, Joyce’s use of an incorporative means in which the object is both total and coherent to the *radiance* circumvents the effect of being but interpretation to give truth and meaning to the narrative itself through the establishment of meaning to the parts and interpretation. By this, *epiphany* is made to progress the protagonist’s development in which the mundane is transformed into the radiant – the ordinary into the extraordinary.

The true conflict of *A Portrait* is not of man *versus* the church, or society, albeit that these play important roles within the novel. Invariably, the conflict always returns to man against

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

the self as Stephen must overcome his own identity, to find who he is, in order to avoid the pitfalls found within *Dubliners*. Joyce's works are ones of self-discovery in which the protagonist's identity is the main antagonist.

As a case in point, the name of Dedalus obviously relates in metaphor to the great Greek mythological figure of *Daedalus*. What is important of this association however is that Daedalus is a figure who creates a labyrinth and is jailed as to not release its secrets. *Daedalus* almost becomes victim to it as well, but flees using wings fashioned from feathers and wax in which his son *Icarus* dies. *Daedalus* as a mythological character embodies within his respective context of the dangers of overcoming one's limit is. One must learn to not fly too close to the sun, so to speak, as to not be victim to it. In the same instance, when one is party to secret knowledge that others do not share it may liberate or bring about one's downfall. *Daedalus* is freed by both his skill but is victim to it as well in that his son's death is the counterpoint for when the knowledge overtakes the individual. Stephen, in this same manner, must run the gambit of avoiding traps which confront him at every turn of his development as running through a labyrinth but his reflection and reaching of *claritas* allows him to know the right path, even if he is not aware of it. The actual danger that Stephen faces is that he does not succumb to a misinterpretation of the knowledge of which he obtains in order to free himself as to become trapped in a maze of paralysis. With this mythological reference, Joyce implies that Stephen must always balance his desire to flee the looming threat of Ireland¹⁹ as a prison to his self with the danger of overestimating his own abilities. The birds that appear to Stephen in the third section of Chapter five signals that it is finally time for Stephen, now fully formed as an artist, to take flight himself.

*

The epiphany, as Joyce utilizes it, is unique to *A Portrait* in that it stands out from other common usage of epiphany in which the revelation of information is given as to illuminate a specific point of information or data. Instead, Joyce disassembles the epiphany form into its base function of the reveal and applies to a broader expanse within the plot structure. The epiphany intersperses the lot as a narrative device in which the aspects of *wholeness*, *harmony*, and *radiance* are unveiled that both perpetuate story and develop character.

To gain a clearer understanding of this stark difference, first one must examine the more

¹⁹ "Ireland is the old saw that eats her farrow" (P 231).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

classical sense of the epiphany. According to Florence L. Walzl, as presented in his paper on the epiphanies in Joyce, “the term *epiphany* may be deduced etymologically. The basic meaning in Greek of *epifaneia* is *appearance* or *manifestation*, and the word is related to a verb meaning *to display* or *show forth*” (“The Liturgy of the Epiphany Season” 436). Walzl also notes that the religious connotation of an epiphany is inseparable from the epiphany concept, as a larger or greater force seems to drive the revelation given in the epiphany, it is “a visible manifestation of a hidden divinity either in a form of a personal appearance, or by some deed of power by which its presence is made known” (“The Liturgy of the Epiphany Season” 436). In religious terms, epiphany may also refer specifically to the feast of the Epiphany on the 6th of January in the Catholic Church. This Feast also directly embodies what the idea of epiphany is, albeit indirectly in terms of how it functions in the literary sense, as it honors the manifestation of Jesus Christ’s ascendance to Earth, and the realization that he is the Messiah, i.e. a revelation from a greater source.

To better illustrate this very traditional concept of epiphany, one only need to turn to the works of the ancient writers of religious texts. The Bible offers a number of characters who undergo transformation through a moment of epiphany which, when analyzed through the lens of modern literary analysis, can be said to shift the character into that which counters the original in their character’s essence. Though known to the reader from the outset of Exodus, Moses has his identity revealed to him by Yahweh when undergoing the motif of the spiritual journey into the desert, after which he reluctantly becomes the exact opposite of his former identity. Christ, as fasts for forty days in the desert is tempted by the archetype of the trickster after which it becomes clear that he is the son of god and will undergo a transformative process in which his spiritual nature will change reality (the motif of the knowledge changing reality). Paul is noted to be travelling on the road to Damascus when he is struck by light which completely transforms his character from one of a persecutor of Christians into one who is their main theologian (even changing his name from Saul to Paul). Hamlet is also subject to this same epiphanic nature in which his father’s death is revealed to him in one instant, afterwards changing the story into one of revenge and self-examination.

This is not merely the case for the classic literary text, where a spark elicits the sudden shift in character. Beja is of the firm belief that “[E]piphanies do in fact provide for readers of modern fiction: the privileged moments, the sudden spiritual manifestation, the moment of being,

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

the blaze of light, the flash, the glare that only great art can generate” (232). It is in these guiding lights that Joyce chose to place his character and reveal his inner desire, through a series of revelations, on the road of developing his protagonist.

While Herbert Gold states that “the experience of epiphany is characteristic of great literature” (60) such as this aforementioned sampling, none of these are even tantamount to Joyce’s use of epiphany. His writing has no single moment of revelation onto which the narrative pivots, but it is a dialogue of the self in which the character is developed. These classical instances of epiphany pivot on one moment in which knowledge is attained or given but then entirely transforms the story and protagonist. The epiphany even empowers the protagonist with a motivation that then needs to seek resolution. In other words, the Joyce epiphany is not as such totally independent of this classical concept, but is so entirely its own that it cannot be said to be related. While the traditional revelation of the character within the context of the narrative serves to address and transform the entirety of the plot and character, for Joyce it is but piecemeal to a revelatory process in which the examination of thought arrives at a total revelation through a series of epiphanic episodes. The aim though matches the method as in religious narratives tend to provide a catalyst of change that imbibes meaning into certain points within a text, Joyce is seeking to undergo the examination of what it means to grow closer to the truth.

The epiphany, as Joyce utilizes it, has an instance upon which a series of events thereafter fall answering a distinct question or resolves one conflict, resulting in the attainment of one idea, after which another “epiphanic” episode will draw upon that prior. The epiphany only slightly changes the protagonist in perpetuation of the motivation and development and does not somehow give a motivation that is final to the character. Whether as a recollection of memory from which the epiphany itself later burst, or as one which happens in the very moment, its employment is fundamental for endorsing the character’s identity. Beja discusses the importance of epiphany in Joyce’s art claiming how:

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

[S]ometimes these experiences seem purely fictional, with little or no biographical basis. At times ... they are based on the incidents he had preserved as ‘epiphanies’ after they had actually occurred to him. Usually he [Joyce] combined these two methods, changing and modifying until he produced something which Joyce found himself, exist permanently in the world he created.
(81)

Jung characterizes the understanding gained through revelation or epiphany as actualization of the self or internalization. Jung, Joyce, and Aquinas all share the same attitude of there being an externality to the process of knowledge formation in the finding of “truth”, though all term it differently (Jung seeks to better understand the self, Joyce seeks to better understand the relationship of the individual to aesthetics, and Aquinas seeks to understand the relationship of God to the individual). The search is archetypal as an experience, as well as the ends of which an understanding is arrived at that is transformative due to its revelatory nature.

*

Joyce draws upon Aquinas in the concept of coming to the revelation of the divine so as to make distinct the salvation from both the self and the reality which the self confronts as delivered through access to information transcendent to the setting, circumstance, and character himself. Jung also approaches a substantive similar approach in which one’s self-identity progresses through a state in which conflict and development can be accorded to a number of specific archetypes in the progression, but which enlighten the self nonetheless at every step or help it on its journey. In this manner, Jung, Joyce, and Aquinas are inevitably equals, despite their massive and incongruous aims. What unites them is the acknowledgement that the self is subject to the externality of the attainment of knowledge which transforms it and its reality thereof. Aquinas calls this God, Jung the Mandala, and Joyce terms it as the Wings Of Art, but to each their own, Aquinas establishes the external nature of knowledge which Joyce utilizes and Jung illustrates the archetypal journey of the hero, Joyce merely provides a narrative as to express these facts.

Joyce uses the narrative of *A Portrait* as to relate the experience of accessing this knowledge through a number of epiphanies; in such manner, Joyce obviously structures the macro-narrative of the work to intersect among a line of epiphanies. To this aim, though, the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

micro level of the narrative aims to explore the unveiling of the epiphany to the character to the ultimate revelation. As according to Jungian archetype, Joyce symbolizes the common and venal to objectify that which leads to epiphany, as to show that it is not merely divinely inspired but of a human inspirational origin, i.e., coming to terms with the self as guided by the external, not realizing the external and finding the self within it.

Nevertheless, the two are established equally upon Aquinas’ affirmation of the nature of the *telos* of the divine to a revelatory experience in which knowledge guides the individual towards a “godly” nature through which the reality of reason may rest, as the otherwise reasoning of reality is faulty. Furthermore, salvation, in the sense of being liberated from the carnality of the flesh, may only be sought through these channels. Lamentably, the knowledge is outside the bounds of reason, which is why it is unveiled and uncovered in a revelatory sense: “It was necessary for our salvation that there be a knowledge revealed by God, besides philosophical science built up by human reason. Firstly, indeed, because the human being is directed to God, as to an end that surpasses the grasp of his reason” (Aquinas, *Summa*; pt. 1, q. 1, art. 1).

Protracted to the complication of the revelation is that the individual need not necessarily discover the path to the divine through mere revelation but must also be directed towards it as an end (*telos*), meaning that revelation can be misinterpreted, misguided, and misunderstood without being aware of its aim: “But the end must first be known by men who are to direct their thoughts and actions to the end. Hence it was necessary for the salvation of man that certain truths which exceed human reason should be made known to him by divine revelation” (Aquinas, *Summa*; pt. 1, q. 1, art. 1).

Joyce is in agreement, but terms it not as the divine sense of “God” in Aquinas’ teleology. Instead, Joyce views it as a method of determining what is beautiful, which itself shall later be termed as “art”. This shall be also the object of guidance, revelation, and the basis of the epiphany within the work. Stephen in *A Portrait*, while discussing the nature of the artist, as he would be so designated as the protagonist, lays out both his *modus operandi* and the means by which the revelatory is to be attained by reinterpreting Aquinas as to reflect his own stance:

To finish what I was saying about beauty, said Stephen, the most satisfying relations of the sensible must therefore correspond to the necessary phases of

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

artistic apprehension. Find these and you find the qualities of universal beauty. Aquinas says: *Ad pulcritudinem tria requiruntur integritas, consonantia, claritas.* I translate it so: *Three things are needed for beauty, wholeness, harmony and radiance.* (P 241)

Joyce directly utilizes the Latin quote from Aquinas but reinterprets it in order to establish the terms by which a revelation can occur. By doing so, Joyce shall remove the divinity concept of Aquinas as well as the disjunction between all three states as one incorporative whole. Joyce creates a liminal boundary in which the terms of aesthetics may be defined and be counter to Aquinas, as if to demonstrate a theoretical foundation of, but contrarian to them. Though this be but philosophy, from a literary standpoint, Joyce extends this discussion as a means by which a dialogue lays the foundation of the narrative use of epiphany as to be understood in the author's context. To do so is challenging. By drawing upon Aquinas, Joyce needs to define the incorporative nature of the revelatory as to create a framework in which the multiple epiphanies of which he presents in his *bildungsroman* can also be seen as a narrative means as to describe the development of the character into a whole, in which all epiphanies are not seen as incongruent to the total, but rather as one to the whole which leads Stephen down a path to the attainment of understanding of beauty as opposed to the background of which the protagonist is set. This would appear to run counter to Aquinas, but is actually a redevelopment of his teleology in which the revelatory comes from an examination of the totality of being and not revealed externally. Ultimately, Joyce strives to make an argument for knowing the world as knowing the self directly. *A Portrait* lays the foundation allegorically to state that one may find revelatory experiences through examining one's life internally and not be granted wisdom externally. Here is the points of the inter lattice of thought which run contrary to Aquinas.

If the passage is further examined, it is readily seen that Joyce rejects the first principle of Aquinas in which the object has different forms as according to the knowledge of it. Joyce claims an oppositional attitude by stating that the object and seeing it for what it is tantamount as one. Such sentiment also occurs with the overarching plot of the narrative proper in which Stephen must overcome interspersed antagonisms which hinder him from finding the truth of the nature in a thing or in himself by confronting multiple conflicts in which he becomes better enlightened with each passing epiphanic phase.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

After providing a redefinition to the terms themselves, Stephen begins to lay out a classification system of aesthetics that are to define the symbolism of the narrative in which the epiphanies may be traced to their objects of origin but are incorporative as such in a way that the knowledge of them as a whole through the realization of their respective *telos* is the epiphany lending itself to the revelation which emerges from viewing the object for what it is and not a transcendent nature of a prescribed meaning of divinity. In such manner, Joyce provides for that ability to interpret these epiphanies enacting symbols. Moreover, these epiphanies also allow for their interpretation by archetypal means of attaining a secret knowledge, as one that is evident when only examined and not given. Such is contrary to Aquinas, even counter to his theories of revelation of the divine.

When Stephen asks Lynch to examine a basket he deconstructs and reassembles Aquinian theory. First, it is approached as Aquinas would, through its examination as an object. Stephen asks Lynch to look at a basket, to which Lynch responds that he “sees” it. Stephen quickly follows with the words “in order to see it” (*P* 241) by which delineation is made between the nature of true perception for what the object is and what it may be perceived to be. Joyce here is using wording from the outset as to mark the importance of the epiphany for the actual realization of what the object is given its circumstance. Joyce notes that the first apprehension may be but to its physical nature, separating it from its circumstance:

Your mind first of all separates the basket from the rest of the visible universe which is not the basket. The first phase of apprehension is a bounding line drawn about the object to be apprehended. An esthetic image is presented to us either in space or in time. What is audible is presented in time, what is visible is presented in space. (*P* 241)

Yet Stephen quickly refutes this argument by stating that the separation defines the object by being placed against the totality of that which it is not.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

But temporal or spatial, the esthetic image is first luminously apprehended as selfbounded and self-contained upon the immeasurable background of space or time which is not it. You apprehended it as one thing. You see it as one whole. You apprehend its wholeness. That is *integritas*. (P 241)

In this sense, an argument is made that only by understanding the whole of the parts may the individual object be also understood. The very same approach shall be utilized when approaching objects or events that act as catalysts to inspire epiphanic moments of revelation. Such sentiment also reflects the attitudes of Stephen as he undergoes an archetypal quest, in the motif sense of the hero's journey, in that he gradually comes to discern his own visage of identity as set out against the background of his origins. This argument is of a duality in which both sphere of the object and otherness interlay upon one another to create a whole, in which the complexity of the two may actually be held apparent and equal as opposed to an interlayered pyramid of *telos* being given from an inherent secondary source; i.e., the revelatory is internal, not external in its creation. Stephen reinforces this assertion through the definition of *harmony*, to which is ascribed the perception of the object as determined by perceiving it within its congruent parts as unique to a respective harmony and rhythm.

You pass from point to point, led by its formal lines; you apprehend it as balanced part against part within its limits; you feel the rhythm of its structure ... the synthesis of immediate perception is followed by the analysis of apprehension. Having first felt that it is one thing you feel now that it is a thing. You apprehend it as complex, multiple, divisible, separable, made up of its parts, the result of its parts and their sum, harmonious. That is *consonantia*. (P 241-2)

Passing from the purely foundational aspect of this point of the nature of a thing being itself and not itself, the argumentation then addresses the actually essence of the object. If Stephen is here mirrored as though he is not defined by either himself or his circumstance, it then begs the question as to where the definity of Stephen, or the object for that matter, does arise from.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

The connotation of the word ... is rather vague. Aquinas uses a term which seems to be inexact. It baffled me for a long time. It would lead you to believe that he had in mind symbolism or idealism, the supreme quality of beauty being a light from some other world, the idea of which the matter was but the shadow, the reality of which it was but the symbol. I thought he might mean that *claritas* was the artistic discovery²⁰ and representation of the divine purpose in anything or a force of generalization which would make the esthetic image a universal one, make it outshine its proper conditions. (P 242)

Stephen rejects the external essence of the object and its discovery as lending meaning to reality, as if reality were but a shadow of the actual light. Instead, the argumentation aims to establish that the actual meaning or essence of the nature of reality is found within itself, and not externally.

But that is literary talk. I understand it so. When you have apprehended that basket as one thing and have then analysed it according to its form and apprehended it as a thing you make the only synthesis which is logically and esthetically permissible. You see that it is that thing which it is and no other thing. The radiance of which he speaks is the scholastic *quidditas*, the *whatness* of a thing. This supreme quality is felt by the artist when the esthetic image is first conceived in his imagination. (P 242)

Ultimately, Joyce needs to differentiate between the divinely inspired aesthetic as applied to the object being instilled with the grace of God to which it is granted with a sense of being or

²⁰ Campbell's view on Joyce's aesthetic experience and definition is extensive, but illuminating: "Joyce's formula for the aesthetic experience is that it does not move you to want to possess the object. A work of art that moves you to possess the object depicted, he calls pornography. Nor does the aesthetic experience move you to criticize and reject the object – such art he calls didactic, or social criticism in art. The aesthetic experience is a simple beholding of the object. Joyce says that you put a frame around it and see it first as one thing, and that, in seeing it as one thing, you then become aware of the relationship of part to part, each part to the whole, and the whole to each of its parts. This is the essential, aesthetic factor - rhythm, the harmonious rhythm of relationships. And when a fortunate rhythm has been struck by the artist, you experience a radiance. You are held in aesthetic arrest. That is the epiphany. And that is what might in religious terms be thought of as the all-informing Christ principle coming through" (*The Power of Myth* 278).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

meaning to that which is inspired internally, counterposed to the external extension of Aquinas. As a case in point of illustration to this fact, Stephen concludes his argument by qualifying that the artist is the manifest of the reverse in which the artistic concept comes *a priori* to the creation of the object, which runs against Aquinas’ teleology in which the object exists firstly through the divine and ultimately through that which is not itself. Joyce, by doing so, makes an argument for an aesthetic that is freed from the bounds of non-symbolism. Aquinas would have it that an object is merely that what it is and its meaning is multivarious through the level of its relation to the divine. Joyce would have it that the aesthetically divine and its actualization are one in the same (the ultimate end of *A Portrait* when Stephen realizes the calling of his identity as an artist), as art is the manifestation of idea and *vice versa*. This conclusion lends insight into why epiphany is so widely used within the work as the object of the epiphany and the realization thereof are both equal and not layered upon one another; as well as that art for art’s sake, as it were, is logically enough to grant the essence of existence to the object as well as to life as a whole.

William T. Noon, in his prominent study *Joyce and Aquinas*, offers insight in “How Curious an Epiphany” chiefly relates to Aquinas’ poetical expression with Joyce’s. He argues that this symbolic nature was something in which Joyce found a skeleton for his own thoughts and sense of aesthetics, at least in their correspondence: “Joyce must have been struck by Aquinas’ treatment of poetic expression as symbolic utterance, and that he would have found in the Aquinian texts he was reading a congenial philosophical justification and incentive for the new symbolic dimensions of his own writing” (77). Noon strives to clarify this differentiation as he finds the distinction between the radiance of Aquinas and the symbolization of Joyce to non-mutual in the nature of their bases, as Stephen assumes the concept, taking it on to himself, without the same foundation. What is more and more to the point, such harmonization of the two as Joyce ascribing the meaning into this framework may account for the value of symbolization applied within Joyce’s works, which *A Portrait* initiates in its free flowing symbolization: “[i]t becomes easier to account for the new Joycean shift as to the location of radiance (*claritas*), from the actual experience of the spectator in life to the verbal act or construct that imaginatively represents this experience in the symbols of language, re-enacts it through illuminating images (though not purely luminous) for the contemplation of the imaginative mind” (Noon, *Joyce and Aquinas* 77). What Noon seems to suggest but only leaves to be inferred is that Joyce can relate

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

in this manner the method by which the epiphany is arrived at as being both an individual and universal nature (through means of the abstract symbolization of it), while Aquinas would not through claims of unique sources of revelation.

Noon also asserts that the attention paid to the spark of aesthetic epiphany within Joyce is particular to Joyce's own writing, in that it assists in the transformation of the common into the symbolic which may have its own particular associated meanings, as has been here discussed within this work. Noon focuses on the use of the object's interpretive function that extends the meaning of the word usage and selection itself:

[t]he word plays within literature a role that is handled outside of literature by some significant event or tangible symbol ... or figurative gesture or sign. In acting as a vicar or proxy for the non-verbal symbol, the word never ceases to be a word, subject to the same tensions of referential meaning which must arise in all metaphorical predications of language, but subject too to the manipulation of the writer in way that nonverbal signs, or *facts*, ordinarily cannot be. (*Joyce and Aquinas* 79)

Therein, Noon maintains that Joyce utilized the words of his writing, especially those which may seem out of place within the context of grander thought, to be as inherent to the overall construct of their creation as the ideal forms which the writing portend as they suggest and signify to the reader an essence detached from the original common itemized meaning of the word itself, transferring it into the symbolic. Oddly enough, this relates backwards to Aquinas as well, who himself argued that beauty adds to an object in the same manner, elevating it into a higher level of known presence: “Beauty adds to goodness a relation to the cognitive faculty: so that ‘good’ means that which simply pleases the appetite; while the ‘beautiful’ is something pleasant to apprehend” (Aquinas, *Summa*; pt. 1-2, q. 27, art. 1, 3). Given Noon's thoughts on the matter, it can be safely concluded that Joyce's writing, which sought to incorporate venal and carnal pleasures with aesthetic beauty, aims to reveal the extraordinary found in the ordinary – the nature of Joyce's epiphany and symbolization thereof

Bearing this in mind, we now turn to the novel itself.

4.3. A Portrait Portrayed in Archetypes

As Joyce writes his *bildungsroman*, the narrative line of action is for the protagonist to define himself on his own journey in life, as the path of a hero overcoming his own obstacles. Joyce pivots upon these epiphanies as signs along the way in which reality becomes more focused and less blurred (in a non-literal sense), in which Stephen, upon reaching a point of revelation, apprehends his own nature better which extends the breadth of his journey. It is conspicuously clear in this regard why Joyce asserts so much attention in the text to the passage clarifying Aquinas, as it is the exact manner in which the narrative unfolds. In other words, the struggle of the protagonist within *A Portrait* is to perceive himself as he actually is, despite the many pitfalls that face him; it is for Stephen to become actualized in accord to his own nature, and not that assigned to him externally.

In *A Portrait*, Joyce would otherwise seemingly undertake an exogenesis on the liberation from the confining antagonisms found facing the protagonists of *Dubliners*. As had been seen with Gabriel in “The Dead”, the bonds of self-imposed paralysis merge upon the distancing of reality to the self through a means of succumbing to a paralytic nature that supersedes self-identity. Joyce aims for the opposite in *A Portrait*. The encounters and development of the character of Stephen Dedalus are thoroughly elaborate and more than just a purview into a snapshot of a single symbolic character; rather they track the progress of the protagonists through the emergence from antagonism. The key factor between *Dubliners* and *A Portrait* in this regard rests on the ability to confront the paralysis as well as the paralytic setting and circumstance the character faces. Ultimately, this congruency can be simplified into what Gabriel had done but Mr. Duffy had not, which is the incorporation of the other into the self (the *anima/animus* concept). Stephen does not find that he must be singularly relegated to any device as subjected to himself but one of his own making. Oddly enough, Joyce accomplishes this by having Stephen Dedalus actively internalize that which happens, instead of merely accepting the means of circumstance, which shall be further finalized upon review in *Ulysses*. Tindall concurs that the underlying theme of *A Portrait* is a distinct rejection of the concept of self-imposed isolation. Distinct from the isolated humans of *Dubliners*, *A Portrait* reiterates a number of key words that, “thematically recurrent, carry feelings and idea with hypnotic effect. ‘Touch’ and

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

‘alone’, together with ‘love’, were to become the key words of *A Portrait*, as ‘communion’ was to become climatic in *Ulysses*” (*Guide to James Joyce* 32).

4.3.1. Epiphanic Moments as Archetypal Experience

The progression of the journey of the hero, or the protagonist for that matter, is not a fluid one in which the end result is determined by primary factors that are given as foreshadowing. Instead, the events of the narrative in which the protagonist displays a development of character aiming towards its resolution accords to a harmonization of antagonism with protagonism as a gradual process unraveling as much as the plot does. Those areas in which aid comes to the protagonist are the tools the protagonist uses through lessons gained through prior experience allowing the character to progress through an overarching development from the outset to the conclusion, to the extent that the initial character shares only in name with the final character as the two are comprehensively different, though do encompass one whole.

Jung addresses the internalization of the myth, which itself encompasses archetype and motif. When the individual recognizes the relation of the self to the outside narrative experience (i.e., the other concept as being one in the same as the self), an understanding of the nature of the archetypal event in which the self is reflected against the other occurs as the same as, for instance, the reader to the story. The protagonist’s journey from the outset to the end is internalized as well by the reader on a level of understanding overarching archetypal implications in which the story, as a symbol or motif of struggles or adventures the individual, overcomes their own respective antagonisms and is enriched by the experience. Jung terms these archetypes, as the myth or narrative structure as such is repeated throughout the collective conscious of humanity. Moreover, Campbell applies this to mythology to illustrate the universal structure to the nature of the narrative in the sense of a hero’s myth or journey. Joyce also is relevant to this regard as he utilizes the same aspects of the hero coming to find himself, where the steps of this line of action which reveal the mutating nature of the protagonist come as the epiphany in Joyce’s case.

Jung foremostly addresses the inner development of the self in which progress comes through addressing an inner nature as it appears to cast light onto the dark and hidden aspects of

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

life, which, when revealed, are thereby incorporated and develop into the self *per se*. These revelatory moments of knowledge of the self are those which stand out most prominently and leave their own mark, giving meaning to the self as well. Jung goes so far as to state that these experiences in confrontation with the other, inner reality of the mind have created his existence:

[i]n the end the only events in my life worth telling are those when the imperishable world irrupted into the transitory one. That is why I speak chiefly of inner experiences, amongst which I include my dreams and visions... All other memories of travels, people and my surroundings have paled beside these interior happenings. ... Recollection of the outward events of my life has largely faded or disappeared. But my encounters with the ‘other’ reality, my bouts with the unconscious, are indelibly engraved upon my memory. In that realm there has always been wealth in abundance, and everything else has lost importance by comparison. (*MDR* 4-5)

The path the individual has set out on is treacherous, not merely from the conflicts which arise along it, but also for the motivation thereof, which must also exist. The hero on his journey receives an initial call, according to Campbell, but the motivation to set out on the actual journey are not one in the same, or the end result. Therein, the motivation is changed when it is revealed internally from a self form of knowledge that is carried by the protagonist, but the end result remains, ultimately, the final expanse of the journey as the conclusion is reached.

Jung terms such knowledge that is revelatory as a secret which is contained by the individual within the self. This secret can either inspire or transcend into madness, being a matter of the outside appearance of its nature as the individual as it manifests.

[t]he individual on his lonely path needs a secret which for various reasons he may not or cannot reveal. Such a secret reinforces him in the isolation of his individual aims. A great many individuals cannot bear this isolation. They are the neurotics, who necessarily play hide-and-seek with others as well as with themselves... As a rule they end by surrendering their individual goal to their craving for collective conformity—a procedure which all the opinions, beliefs,

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

and ideals of their environment encourage ... Only a secret which the individual cannot betray— one which he fears to give away, or which he cannot formulate in words—can prevent the otherwise inevitable retrogression. (*MDR* 344)

In *A Portrait*, Joyce utilizes the epiphany as a narrative tool, i.e. structural device, which both furthers the antagonism vs. protagonist relationship of development for the main character of Stephen as well as each epiphany bringing about secret information which sheds light on the unseen and which is built upon again and again until the ultimate result of the conclusion is achieved. In *A Portrait*'s case, it is the realization of the self as “an artist as a young man”.

The protagonist does not find resolution to the antagonism of the conflict easily. It comes in bits and pieces instead of a deluge, but when it is finally obtained, it is released as if in a flood of revelation that has changed the character prior and the character which is to come. When resolution is attained through coming to terms with the secret that is carried by the character, it transforms all physical boundaries and obstacles that the character has transcended.

Yet, as this transformation is one of an absolute nature elucidating the totality of the narrative itself, the protagonist is required to be broken down and dissected piece by piece as every aspect of their character is disassembled. Only through doing so may the resolution come about, in fits, where the character confronts one hurdle to overcome it, but to be challenged again. Campbell refers to this transformation of the protagonist in the idea that “the agony of breaking through personal limitations is the agony of spiritual growth” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 190).

In the terms of Jung, the individual self grows in a spiritual sense in spite of its physical limitations as it is driven onwards through the secret which it carries. As in narrative terms, this is but the motivation of the character. In terms of the mythological, or narrative theory as such, it is the aesthetic. Campbell notes that all these come together in the form of art. Joyce also utilizes this as the term by which Stephen develops, as he emerges as the artist. Therein, *A Portrait* may not necessarily be seen as simply the biographical development of the character, but as a means by which aesthetics may change the world. Campbell here touches upon this point, stating that

[a]rt, literature, myth and cult, philosophy, and ascetic disciplines are instruments to help the individual past his limiting horizons into spheres of ever-expanding

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

realization. As he crosses threshold after threshold, conquering dragon after dragon, the stature of the divinity that he summons to his highest wish increases, until it subsumes the cosmos. Finally, the mind breaks the bounding sphere of the cosmos to a realization transcending all experiences of form—all symbolizations, all divinities: a realization of the ineluctable void. (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 190)

Joyce takes up this same idea utilizing the means of aesthetic experience as the ultimate end which the protagonist Stephen comes to terms with in *A Portrait* and which saves the protagonist from his surroundings by providing illumination into the character and the circumstances of setting that are developed throughout the narrative as one of escape, unlike that of *Dubliners*, already discussed.

The epigraph of *A Portrait*, “Et ignotas animum dimittit in artes”, is a line from Ovid’s, *Metamorphoses* (188; bk. 8). Beyond the matter of the fact that the *Metamorphoses* itself is a work of an artist surpassing through trials and tribulations in order to triumph in his nature as the artist of significant and unearthly power, it is meant to mirror a similarity to *A Portrait*. Moreover, it also sets the novel’s tone. Loosely translated, it may be read as: “To arts unknown he bends his wits, and alters nature” or “And he applied his spirit to obscure arts”²¹. Stephen is presented as such a character, one who is transformed from an innocent child, sinner, a priest to be, into a rebel whose transmogrification into the artist and revelation of his own identity in spite of the circumstance of rejecting everything that has been offered to him and all that has supposedly made him (as the basis of his character) is the plot itself. Though Stephen finds that he should lead the path of the artist, that is not the true message, rather than finding oneself through confrontation of one’s own beliefs and being lifted out of the jailing of the self-paralysis of one’s character is an art itself. In many aspects, *A Portrait* is the antidote to *Dubliners*, a panacea of paralysis, which is encapsulated by its conclusion: “I may learn in my own life and away from home and friends what the heart is and what it feels. Amen. So be it. Welcome, O life, I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race” (P 288).

²¹ As referenced in the lines: “Between ‘em both her equal wings display’d” (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 188; bk. 8).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

The rejection alone separates Stephen from those of Dubliners but it is through the rejection as well that he may be freed and experience *life*. However, the revelation of this experience comes as the ultimate goal based upon the epiphanies that come before it, freeing the protagonist from his inner and outward antagonism. Joyce utilizes these epiphanies therefore as a framework by which the protagonist of Stephen has his own journey.

*

The epistemological nature of the concept of epiphany, though varied throughout in the means and circumstances by which it is arrived at and the nature after of the knowledge gained, remains the same in all forms in spite of its innumerable variances that lead to an equally disparate end; i.e., the epiphany is the same in its revelatory form in how it is achieved, and the knowledge resulting always illuminating and transformative despite what the epiphany is. Therein, the epiphany is an archetypal motif, or in Beja's words “an element in *all* human experience” (80) and pragmatic “manifestation[s] of psychological truth, of character, of society” (80).

An epiphany can be further defined as a “spiritual manifestation”, “personal revelation” or “process of enlightenment” which opens new horizons by allowing one to find greater insight into a specific area or topic by first presenting a device or event that acts as a revelation to this person, which later will be realized after having undergone inherent examination. To quote Morris Beja on the works of Joyce, “epiphanies are moments in which an external divine force reveals the truth” and “an epiphany is a sudden spiritual ‘manifestation’ – a showing forth, an illumination, a revelation” (15). Based on these sources, an epiphany may be defined as a revelation brought on through an image or event that reveals knowledge epidemically that had not been known and which may be only known to whom it is revealed, but still may be understood by others since it is archetypal in nature.

Joyce is not unique in his use of epiphany and certainly “the epiphany is not peculiar to Joyce alone. Virtually every writer experiences a sense of revelation when he beholds a fragment of his ordinary world across what Bullough has called a ‘psychic distance’ – disassociated from his subjective and practical concerns” (Hendry 451). However, what separates the works of Joyce in their use of epiphanies is that “he wanted his reader to understand always, through suggestion rather than direct statement” (Budgen, 21). In this lies the true power of his use of epiphanies: “[it] is in its ability to dramatize meaning and do away with the necessity for

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

explanation. The epiphany per se is not a symbol or image, though it may arise from one” (Beja 75).

Although he is not specific to the nature of achieving the epiphany, Joyce’s exact definition as he offers it and the epiphany’s significance comes from his early, posthumously published novel, *Stephen Hero*²² which was itself to be transformed and made into *A Portrait*. Joyce adds the idea particularly that the epiphany as it is experienced is but ephemeral in duration but so grand that it warrants further exploration and examination to discover its meaning:

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

The exact wording of “memorable phase of the mind itself” alludes to a state of knowing which is only temporarily achieved and in which new revelatory knowledge is discovered, despite the process itself being brief. Joyce assigns a derived prominence to the epiphany based upon chaining them together, as new insight form one to another is garnered, but the symbolic

²² What seems inevitable for every devoted reader of Joyce, let alone the academic, is to make an outright comparative study between *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait*. This study seeks to limit itself from doing so, as it need not add to the inexhaustible evaluations that have been already pointed out by Joyce’s many scholars. Nevertheless, the wealth of detail that does appear in *Stephen Hero* cannot be simply let to pass, especially in terms of what it proffers as insight into Joyce, serving as an extension to better understand Stephen’s *concept of epiphany*. In this regard, what one can accept as a conclusion of his aesthetic theory of epiphany as presented in *Stephen Hero* and closely related to that in *A Portrait* is summed up as: “After the analysis which discovers the second quality the mind makes the only logically possible synthesis and discovers the third quality. This is the moment which I call epiphany. First we recognise that the object is one integral thing, then we recognise that it is an organised composite structure, a thing in fact: finally, when the relation of the parts is exquisite, when the parts are adjusted to the special point, we recognise that it is that thing which it is. Its soul, its whatness, leaps to us from the vestment of its appearance. The soul of the commonest object, the structure of which is so adjusted, seems to us radiant. The object achieves its epiphany” (*SH* 212). In such similar nature, Joyce also approaches the mundane to reveal the extraordinary in the same symbolic manner as in *A Portrait*. At one point, Joyce writes that “the clock of the Ballast Office was capable of an epiphany. ... I will pass it time after time, allude to it, refer to it, catch a glimpse of it. It is only an item in the catalogue of Dublin’s street furniture. Then all at once I see it and I know at once what it is: epiphany” (*SH* 211). To support this claim, Stephen (as *Stephen Hero*) refers to the concept better fleshed out with *A Portrait* in support, stating that “[T]he moment the focus is reached the object is epiphanised. It is just in this epiphany that I find the third, the supreme quality of beauty” (*SH* 211).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

nature of their trigger, such as in his words “in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture” also implies that the very physicality of the epiphany as manifested in a tangible form, is but a symbol and shares only with the epiphany liminally. Therein, an object which may inspire the epiphany does not necessarily encompass the knowledge received, but triggers a transformative change. In this very manner, Joyce likely viewed the epiphany as relevant to motivation and development of the character along narratively structural lines which could be imposed on the character through symbolic means of setting in order to enrich the reflective nature of the character against their background. Therein, for Joyce, the epiphany was something to capture and further dwell on, which creates the backbone of the narrative itself, drifting from one epiphany to another, and the readers accompanies the kaleidoscope of the protagonist as he or she strives to clarify it to himself or herself, and in which the reader is also observer and participant.

On this basis, Joyce draws on *epiphany* as a device to utilize events within the line of action of the narrative to further develop the character by investigating, reviewing them, and the importance they have to the character proper. In such manner, Joyce creates an experience as an epiphany and - in the process - a novel. Waltz notes in support of Joyce’s ability to craft a novel on the cerebral level from the everyday commonality of existence familiar to the reader, noting that “in Joyce’s view, the writer transforms real experience into art, having in the process godlike insights into the nature of things, as a result of which his work of art later offers a like experience to the reader” (437). Beja also supports this assertion, stating that Joyce is most famous for “converting the bread of everyday life into art of permanent value ... to record what he liked to call epiphanies” (71).

Having established the nature of the epiphany as in its archetypal context and its symbolic nature, this shall now be applied to *A Portrait* in the context of the progress of Stephen as the protagonist who seeks resolution to his antagonism.

4.3.2. Ecce Puer – The Myth of Baby Tuckoo

The process of the liberation of Stephen from himself is first that of alienation followed by transcendence. In the former, Stephen is made to question himself due to the nature of his surroundings and the interactions thereof. The motif this follows is one in which the protagonist

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

is made to reject his environment in order to transcend it. The motif of transcendence also is split into a subsequent devolvement in which Stephen faces the motif of either understanding the nature of the self or be led down a false path and succumb to false idols which cloud the protagonists understanding and lead to an inevitable demise. Campbell terms this as finding a center, which is the driving force of the protagonist and of the plot itself. Moreover, finding the center for Stephen is the character arc, and, until he finds resolution to this conflict, the story is unable to be resolved (see Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 11).

Stephen fits the archetype of an outsider, outcast. He is bookish and a good student, not even one to get into trouble. It is apparent that he has trouble fitting in (so to say). Nonetheless, he is not considered unique or separate from the other boys in his class. In order for Stephen, who is but a boy, to make any further progress in his actions as a character he must reach a moment of self-realization in which he recognizes himself as different and unique. This must be elicited within the text by Joyce as to make the reader also aware that Stephen exists in a setting forced on to the protagonist from which he must remove himself.

Early in the novel, all congruent areas as such are laid out. The stage is set for Stephen to begin his journey. However, Stephen as but a boy, cannot yet act independently. Instead, he is but an observer to events as they occur. Though the protagonist at this stage does not understand events as they unfold, they reveal an environment against which Stephen is cast. What is more markedly projected in narrative form is the inability of Stephen to act as an independent individual who is able to deal with these forces. Such a fact is laid out repeatedly in snippets where Stephen is forced to kowtow to antagonisms that seem to hold sway over his existence despite their utter absurdity. For this reason, it is made overt in the novel that Stephen is one to apologize (“O, Stephen will apologise. . . . O, if not, the eagles will come and pull out his eyes” [P 8]) though for want of what he should be apologizing for is not only uncertain but irrelevant as well since in these instances he is forced to do so against his better judgment or assume the guilt though not bearing any. This is illusionary to demonstrate the helplessness of the protagonist as stationary.

When Stephen is pushed into a latrine ditch, he is clearly wronged; yet, even though he comes down with a deadly fever as a result, he alone must deal with the consequences. He is even coerced into not telling on the boy, though this means bearing the brunt of the responsibility himself. This instance is not an epiphany but lays groundwork for Stephen as character as a boy:

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

mousy but kindhearted and reflective. Thereafter, set against a firmly established character, when another boy pushes him over at school and he breaks his glasses, Stephen finally does stand up for himself. The epiphany deriving from this moment in which he experiences a sense of feeling wronged or betrayal does not only push him into recognizing himself as an individual but also garners support for him within the group of his fellows. It also ultimately divorces him from the identity he had had prior in which his identity comes purely from an identity of his familial background, as realized when he finds his father and rector laughing over the incident. Moreover, it shall serve again as means to divorce himself from his familial background and his educational background when the time comes for him to further break away from his imposing foundations.

The character arc of self-discovery by essence must undergo a series of events that lend to self-disassociation since only through denying the self can the protagonist free themselves from it (i.e., if the self is accepted as given or inherent, it is never circumspect). To further this point of view, Campbell observes that Joyce has Stephen pass through a number of dissociative states which act as stages linking the novel together; i.e., they serve to dislocate and separate the protagonist from the surroundings in order to establish the protagonist as independent to it. The first stage is distinctly that of the uneasy outsider:

In the *Portrait*, the little boy goes to a school where the athletes play a big role, and he is no good at them. He falls down. He is chilly. He is anxious. To compensate for this experience of being outside ... inner fantasies arise that put the individual at the heart of belongingness. One of the principal images, or tendencies toward imagining ... is that of seeking to find a center. There is a psychic shift to an unknown place which will be the center, and the imagery associated with that centering is very important in the person's thinking. You have the cross and the center. (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 6)

The moments in the novel, as if it were a pendulum crossing over the intersection of self-realization, provide moments of elucidation.

As another case in point, what allows Stephen to emerge outside of these dissociative states is that he is guided by a second field in which the epiphanies eventually lead to an escape

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

from the setting and circumstance, wherein he is allowed to surpass the limitations set by the environment. This theme is the same found in *Dubliners* in which the protagonist characters succumb to the intersection of epiphany. Guiding Stephen is a sense of aesthetic value, again highlighting the value assigned by Stephen in clarifying Stephen's interpretation of Aquinas.

The character arc matches an emergence in which the protagonist comes to know himself through breaking with his surroundings which is an entanglement *per se*, an antagonism of the first order. The second order antagonism is that with the self. These two interact and draw upon one another so that the protagonist confronts himself through the objectivity of surroundings, but leads only to breaking free from them (i.e., defeating one antagonism) but not the other (coming to know the self). The character arc for *A Portrait* and *Ulysses* is “know thyself” in spite of circumstance, but it is not until the latter when the protagonist defeats the second. Moreover, while *Ulysses* is the coming of realization at a return home (a journey full circle) in which the protagonist comes to terms with origins and self, *A Portrait* is the emergence of the self from its origins. Therein, *Ulysses* is “maturity”, but *A Portrait* is “a childhood and adolescence”.

Yet, throughout *A Portrait*, Stephen is forged in his identity in steps which lead him into becoming his own self; *Ulysses* is the acceptance of that self and where it has had its place in its own series of events. In Marxist terms, *A Portrait* is how the product has been made and *Ulysses* is how its history affects it in terms of its essence. In this sense, *Ulysses* places the object in context for final revelation, while *A Portrait* describes the way in which it was created. The process is gradual in nature as well as allegorical.

It would also appear that Joyce has opted to write a narrative of a character who is readily torn between two aspects of dialect in which the antithesis and thesis of Stephen result in the synthesis of his character and subsequent narrative.

Stephen upon revelation in the novel goes through a series of steps in which the character is drawn between a series of forces, usually between a dialectal divide of two, in which a result emerges linking character arc. However, for the width and breadth of the novel, Stephen struggles against the antagonisms of his own making which is superimposed against his narrative background and which is super-reflected through a response by a supporting cast of characters.

The development of the character is therefore tangential when it happens, leading him along a character arc of liberation, but also one in which the next step is both determined and undecided at the same instant as only the end result is Stephen as the artist, but not how he is

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

delivered into such a state. Such then is the motif of the child as they grow. In short, Joyce utilizes this episode to force Stephen to relive his past, but at the same moment it somehow frees him from it. This is a prime example of how Joyce uses epiphany as there is no one moment where the epiphany is revealed, rather it slowly comes to the character over time, through much review.

The child motif could be seen as marking innocence of the individual; however, this is too simple of an interpretation. Instead, the child motif as applied to the character is one in which the inevitable, typically painful transitioning period of the child to the adult has not yet occurred. The child has yet to actually go through a process in which the individual emerges; i.e., the child is formless and is awaiting that which grants it form. The transition effect thereof stems from the events which occur to the child and grant them distinction from their child-self. This transition from child to adulthood is itself a motif as the emergence of the individual. Nevertheless, the child is spectator and witnesses to their own development as the events which mark and band them in their identity are forged. This aspect is not sufficient in and of itself, as simply being a child notes that change is to come, but it is a matter of time. To this regard Kimball concurs, noting that “[t]he occurrence of the child motif ... ordinarily signifies ‘an anticipation of future developments’” (49). Therein, when Stephen is presented as a child, his life is almost a state of the non-transformative time. No events occur and the understanding of them is displaced. When Stephen is “released” from the childlike state, his “history” or own character may be then initiated.

As the child is therefore an empty figure that lacks descriptive qualities due to the corresponding paucity of a history, the child may also then represent all potentials and qualities that are yet to be formed through the acquisition of a history. In Daoism, this is otherwise known as the Puh, or the uncarved block symbolizing a potential nature in all things that one may become prior to the finalizing action.²³ Jung draws upon this same idea, but terms it as the myth of the divine child which represents the promise of a future or may be interpreted as “*futurity*”. Naturally, this runs opposed to the historical nature of the past which has already ascribed the identity and lacks potential. Categorically, therefore, Jung defines the child motif as “potential future. Hence the occurrence of the child-motif in the psychology of the individual signifies as a

²³ For clarification, see Watts, *The Way of Zen*, particularly “The Philosophy of the Tao”, pp. 21-46.

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

rule an anticipation of future developments, even though at first sight it may seem to be a retrospective configuration” (Jung and Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* 115). As applied to *A Portrait*, when Stephen is but a child or a baby, events are scarce if at all present. He cannot even experience the world as he does not comprehend it. The innocent nature of the reflection of his surroundings, which may be read only in a serious nature through subtext or association, is amorphous to the naivety of the character. The imprint of the nature of society, thereby the nature of the adult who is part of the social order by means of “responsibility”.

Jung notes further that the potentiality of the child is sacrosanct in religious terms of the divine as both symbol and archetype to future promise or what has yet to be made immutable, which, as has been thus noted, is counter to the mask of the adult whose life has already been forged. Jung specifically states that “the ‘child’ paves the way for a future change of personality. In the individuation process, it anticipates the figure” (Jung and Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* 115). Stephen’s character, foremost at the outset of the novel, is such a child presenting this same open aspect of the infinitude of possibilities before his life has yet to begin. Nevertheless, the child is additionally that which is able to synthesize the potential and the actual into one, through individuation. However, this process itself is presented by Jung in terms of the subsequent accordance as a result of the antithesis of “what may be” and the thesis of “what simply is”. The synthesis thereof arises to form the individual. Jung qualifies that the child is by default “a *unifying symbol* which unites the opposites; a mediator, bringer of healing, that is, *one who makes whole*. Because it has this meaning, the child-motif is capable of the numerous transformations” (Jung and Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* 115). However, this same process of the child taking on the transformation is to become an individual or self, which is inherent to the process: “The purpose of the individuation process is the *synthesis* of the self. From another point of view the term ‘entelechy’ might be preferable to ‘synthesis’” (Jung and Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* 115). That Jung uses the Aristotelian concept of “entelechy” is also of note as it is the embodiment of the individual over the process of individuation; i.e., the nature of the individual coming into being, which is of note as concerns the child into the adult.

In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche touches upon an equitable variation of the child motif of one being unto the fulfillment of the self through a procedural actualization of transformation (famously known as the preamble of the camel, lion, and dragon). He specifically

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

ascribes, though, the same potentiality and nondescript nature of the child as an affirmation to the positive potential as Jung. Moreover, it is the initiator of that which is to come, as if it were a direct signal of immediate change and creation into being. Nietzsche goes further to ascribe the child as “yes” in the sense of affirmation thereof needed to progress beyond antagonism: “The child is innocence and forgetting, a new beginning, a game, a self-propelled wheel, a first movement, a sacred ‘Yes’. For the game of creation, my brothers, a sacred ‘Yes’ is needed: the spirit now wills his own will, and he who had been lost to the world now conquers his own world” (*Thus Spoke Zarathustra* 27). Here the approach is a final reconciliation towards the affirmation of life through happiness as to overcome the struggle. A more ready instance of this concept may be found in Molly’s multiple repetition of the word yes in the last chapter of *Ulysses*. Nonetheless, within *A Portrait*, Stephen’s progression also encompasses the same acceptance, or wholeness, as it is termed.

Stephen’s (as narrator) autobiography is the synthesis between the two theses of being and anti-being – through acceptance of the item and rejection. Although it is not merely for the child portrayal alone in Stephen as he quickly emerges into a young adult, the transformational process of inevitable possibility and the limitation of that possibility to discover the self is the essence of the novel as the motivating force that unfolds both plot and develops character. The novel is non-stationary, just as much as life and individuation is not. Jung observes that “[L]ife is a flux, a flowing into the future, and not a stoppage or a backwash” (Jung and Kerényi, *Essays on a Science of Mythology* 115). To this extent, Joyce writes his novel, forcing his protagonist Stephen to be wrought through the excise of his potential paid to his limitations, as well as escaping them – thereby synthesizing his fictional existence.

The synthesis of the child to be superimposed to its setting, to be limited in its potential to that which simply it must obey, comes early within the narrative. Noting how chapter one opens with the bizarre guilelessness of children’s brief, intangible recollections, it swiftly moves to the school courtyard where all such innocence is mocked as to fit the form of no longer a child but the beginning of the individual. The metaphor is stark as the second part of the first chapter denotes Stephen as an outsider amongst the other boys and reiterates a name for Stephen which is hammered into him unlike the “baby tuckoo” (*P* 7)²⁴ of that prior. As Stephen emerges in an

²⁴ “For Jung, the Self is the precursor of the ego and the director of psychic development. Before the ego forms, the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

individuated form that grows on itself, the same change addresses human development from childhood to adolescence, incorporating physical, cognitive, social changes in personality. However, they do not cease from one transformation of the child to the adult, but are underscored and associated with the “hero-artist” throughout the text.

The synthesized individuation arises, as it should, repeatedly throughout the novel. As Stephen runs to loggerheads against the setting into which he is placed. Riquelme remarks that “[H]is [Joyce’s] contrasting styles in *A Portrait* present a character whose experiences regularly involve opposing forces that seem irreconcilable, such as the violent political and religious antagonisms that Stephen witnesses during the Christmas dinner in part I” (116).

The first epiphany that marks a turning point within the character arc establishes also the continuing antagonism that shall be returned to as regards the Catholic Church *versus* Stephen’s drive of self-liberation as based on the background and environment into which he is placed. The epiphany, here termed as that of the “broken glasses” is bookended by a seeming success against injustice which makes Stephen a hero amongst his peers, but is initiated prior to the event proper at the Christmas dinner of which Stephen is finally allowed to participate in, alluding to the more maturing nature of his character. While at the table, his father, as well as O’Casey (an uncle of sorts), enter a heated argument with Stephen’s aunt Dante. Seemingly around the issue of Parnell and the Catholic Church’s betrayal of him as a national leader for his sins, Stephen, too young to truly understand acts as observer and narrator through whose eyes the scene unfolds objectively - though clear he little understands. Note how he reflects upon Casey: “But why then was he against the priests? Because Dante must be right then. But he had heard his father say that she was a spoiled nun” (*P* 39-40) in which he is unable to distinguish the actual matter at hand but restates the childish nature of that which is repeated to him, denoting a lack of original thought. Naturally, to the reader familiar with context, the issue remains clear of whether the Catholic Church overstepped a boundary to punish rather than serve the Irish people. The dialogue foreshadows a punishment he shall receive at school.

child lives largely in an archetypal world, including projecting the Self onto a doll, teddy bear or ‘security blanket’. One evidence of the existence of the Self is that these are projections of it” (Mattoon, *Jung and the Human Psyche* 43). Through this particular nickname of “baby tuckoo”, Stephen being still a child, identifies himself through his father’s storytelling. Projecting and recognition of his place in the world will continue throughout the second and third chapter, while in the fourth one he is about to find his proper call as a final and fruitful confirmation of his true identity.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

The question undertaken that links both the dinner and the schoolyard is that of sins or transgressions and their appropriate response. It would be mistaken to state otherwise as they are directly associated in more than juxtaposition. While Stephen is left in horror at being subject to his family’s discord, this is the protagonist’s first step forward from a child into a more mature individual – though not yet even in adolescent terms. In brief, it is the protagonist developing in terms of his own character in being able to respond to his environment as his own being. Stephen’s character as a child is not altered through the event of this dinner but shattered at the hand of a vengeful priest. The forewarning of the dinner is that all are subject to the wrath of the Church, but the response doled out is unproportional to that of the sin, even detrimental to the growth of the character of either nation or individual. Stephen then experiences the same firsthand, but not before engaging in the same dialogue proper with his schoolmates. To illustrate, Stephen’s father insists that the Church has damaged all of Ireland at the expense of punishing one. Stephen’s class is made to be punished spiritually for the petty, childishness of others. Many of his classmates claim that they shall go and complain of the general punishment, but none actually do, except, ultimately, Stephen. As Parnell had succumbed to the Church due to infidelity, it is insinuated that the boys were “snogging” and that this was sexual in nature, all of whom are either excommunicated (expelled) or punished severely physically. This reflects onto the rest of class who must do penance, but not for their own sins. Stephen’s father claims the same earlier in the dinner.

The *anima/animus* relationship between Stephen’s family reflects that of his inner skeptical nature and that of the exterior to which Stephen interacts. The *anima* is also that reflected of the mother Church in which he is allowed to germ, mature, blossom, what have you. While the *animus* is the strict cord or logic that Stephen approaches reality as a character. His aunt Dante is a fierce defender of the Irish-Catholic Church as well as his mother, against whom he will eventually come into conflict as he leaves the bosom of the confines of the institution to become a young artist. Yet, his father and the priests of the Church represent a cold, hard reality that is rarely ideal and more based upon the instruction of Church logic. Stephen blindly mirrors back information taught to him by his religious education without bother to question its origins. Here is the *anima*, being absorbed into the mother. The father and Casey act as a counterpoint to break the boy from the bonds of the mother.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

Stephen’s exposure to this perceived same injustice from the domination of another (the archetype of the oppressed) is the primary instance of Stephen’s antagonism with the setting he is also seemingly subjected to. Prior to this event, the character remarks simply upon the Church, while, afterwards, there is always contention in its reflection. The protagonist would appear to recognize the contention of their self-identity (ego) and their opposite. To illustrate, upon completion of the beating and Father Dolan leaving, it is noted distinctly how, “[F]ather Arnall had told them both that they might return to their places without making any difference between them” (P 59), which clearly upsets Stephen; he had not made any mistake, but was still punished in the same manner as the boy who had. By being demarcated and selected for the random nature of injustice, he not only gains an identity but loses trust through the separation.

Joyce underscores the Church as a bringer of blind justice with Stephen’s punishment through use of dichotomy. While the other ancillary character of Fleming is punished for actually having committed the sin, the same actions are reflected onto Stephen, although it is known he is innocent both through narration and reiteration. However, Dolan knows better. Here exists a crux of Stephen’s character which is not possessed by others: change. Stephen shall repeatedly issue statements or go down lines of reasoning that seem to go against his character arc but later recants through self-reasoning. Such argumentation is little found in other characters who are not willing to admit that they have erred, such as Dolan. Already having established that Stephen can have compassion for others – he does not tell on the boy who pushed him into the latrine pit as he actually does take his word – Dolan also has none for him. Neither, it would seem, does the Church.

The antagonism that Stephen shall regularly encounter from the Church stems from these original incidences of being placed within its grasp. Upon the punishment for a perceived sin undeserved by Father Dolan, his natural response is the humiliation that has been indoctrinated by the Church. However, the pure sense of resentment that overcomes him prevents the moment to pass as a mere series of events, becoming a focal point that is reiterated until the end of the novel. “His deep indignation is derived as much from the variation to the central narrative of his early experiences of Christian punishment, as it is from the implicit unfairness of Dolan’s bloody-minded punishment. Furthermore, Stephen’s agonized reaction is marked by a deep sense of humiliation” (Jacobs 225). Nevertheless, in spite of repeated umbrage placed against the antagonists, Stephen struggles with himself foremostly to allow their abandonment and to take

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

free upon his own. The recognition and rejection is the first instance therefore in which Stephen becomes his own person and not that of the envisioned other, in which he can be called “Stephen” and not “the son of Simon”.

Noting the transformation of the act of punishment, Stephen individuates this first action as having import to a sense of identity, which Joyce takes care to detail as if he were a hero embarking upon a journey to seek revenge, reparation, or justice. As Stephen descends into the rector’s office, he leads a single file of all his classmates for support, also receiving reassurance from the pictures of Catholic saints and figures on the wall along the dark corridor which he imagines. “It was dark and silent and his eyes were weak and tired with tears so that he could not see. But he thought they were the portraits of the saints and great men of the order who were looking down on him silently when he passed” (*P* 63).

Though Joyce makes it clear that this is but childish fantasy to some extent, it is not the matter of an unreliable narrator, but using reference characters to illustrate the nature of transformation. Stephen is undertaking a journey to transform himself and, thereby, the world around him. The saints on the wall are figures who have already undergone such a spiritual journey which have changed the reality of others as well. In essence, this is the same motif of the hero descending into the pit or cave to defeat the monster, in which the hero has received knowledge, help, or inspiration from another source that transcends the physical reality into the immaterial and, ultimately, leads to victory. The hero returns victorious and transforms the very nature of life. After having won the battle, Stephen is made aware of himself at a higher level. However, unlike the mere slaying of a beast in which the hero brings back the body and is adulated merely for the act, learning nothing, Stephen takes it upon himself that this shift in his reality shall not change him, asserting that he will be humble and even make a prayer for Father Dolan.

Such a sojourn resembles the first steps of adventure upon which a more classical hero archetype would undertake. Stephen is shaken from the everyday innocence of his childhood into a new unknown area which he must learn to abide by and, inevitably, overcome. He does not do so willingly, rejecting the call by his peers at first, but eventually succumbing to them. Here mirrors the exact *monomyth* of the hero as suggested by Campbell, where the hero finds him or herself in a liminal state that enters into darkness: “In the first stage of this kind of adventure, the

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

hero leaves the realm of the familiar, over which he has some measure of control, and comes to a threshold” (*The Power of Myth* 184).

This junction within the structure of the narrative pivots thereafter into two directions: either the hero must be subsumed by a greater force (generally a monster) or the hero must consume a part of the force and gain its power. Whichever these two may result in, there is a figurative rebirth or change that creates a new hero (protagonist) forged in the identity of passing through an opposite force and not being consumed or enveloped into it, but imbibing its power to create oneself anew. Campbell notes that these both are “a variant of the death - and resurrection theme” (*The Power of Myth* 184). However that may be, the matter of consequence is that the conscious personality has changed due to the transformative power of the experience: “The conscious personality here has come in touch with a charge of unconscious energy which it is unable to handle and must now suffer all the trials and revelations ... while learning how to come to terms with this power of the dark and emerge, at last, to a new way of life” (*The Power of Myth* 184). Incidences of such transformation are comparable to the concept of epiphany as presented by Joyce, in that the latter offer moments of realization and clarity in from which the mind cannot return to a prior state after having been enlightened.

Campbell attributes the transformation as a call and return from the state of nature to itself, whereby the psyche sheds its state of the self in order to connect with the primal nature of existence. By undergoing this process, the hero “has transcended his humanity and reassociated himself with the powers of nature, which are the powers of our life, and from which our minds remove us” (*The Power of Myth* 184). Nevertheless, where all knights go to battle monsters, many do not return. Metaphorically, they have succumbed to the same nature and have been unable to counteract it and return to a state of semblance of their former identity. Given this assumption, the utterance of Stephen after the trial of Father Dolan becomes clearer in nature in that he has not let the anger of the Father’s injustice make himself unjust as well: “He was happy and free; but he would not be anyway proud with Father Dolan. He would be very quiet and obedient: and he wished he could do something kind for him to show him that he was not proud” (*P* 66).

As with a hero who has achieved a great feat, with this reflection, the ending off this chapter to Stephen’s protagonism as well as to the novel itself, registers a singular step forward, but not the departure of the child to the adult. This is to come, signaled by the further obeisance

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

and obedience to the Church in which he emulates. Such is the nature of the child, as has been noted, to reflect the imposition of the outside onto it. As Campbell notes: “As a child, you are brought up in a world of discipline, of obedience, and you are dependent on others. All this has to be transcended when you come to maturity, so that you can live not in dependency but with self-responsible authority. . . . Then comes the one after you have gained your world, of yielding it – the crisis of dismissal, disengagement” (*The Power of Myth* 95). Here Stephen has made one distinction of himself, not enough to be his own as he has not overcome those limitations placed upon him. This state of the child is sufficient to explain the end lines of seeking to be better than Father Dolan, but still somehow unable to distance himself enough from the situation to break free. The end goal here only comes after multiple steps breaking him away and is the conclusion of the novel, but never comes truly into form prior.

It does not serve to have but one instance in accord within *A Portrait* for Stephen to emerge as a protagonist triumphant against all odds. In truth, Stephen’s main point of antagonism is himself in which he must shed the coil of shame which his setting instills and enforces upon him. Stephen, however, becomes hindered in these moments of revelation where he may further distance himself by said shame. Jacobs is of the opinion that Stephen is written as a character encircled by an ingrained humility which must be escaped outright in order to become a character unto his own. This aspect of his character is compounded by the rift he has between himself in the need of humility and the need to forgo it: “Shame is the appropriate response to having transgressed, but Stephen’s response mechanism takes some time to adjust to this fundamental rupture between his sense of the Catholic process and the living abuse of it. His sense of propriety is partially restored after his discussion with the rector, and his sense of obedience and humility is thereafter strongly emphasized” (Jacobs 225).

Ironically, therefore, the first chapter sets the dialecticism of the novel: the same nature pulling Stephen in opposite directions is that which can also ultimately set him aloft. If Jacobs’ argument is to be applied throughout the course of the novel, it also sheds light on why Stephen both constantly wavers and commits to moments of self-liberation only to be pulled in again.

Nonetheless, an action must occur to first tear him away and cause him to be his own individual. The first epiphany, at least to be argued as the first here, i.e., that of the pandybatting, is one that jolts Stephen awake from the slumber of childhood. Naturally, the events of the epiphany are traumatic in order to do so. Here, in the progression of the character arc, Joyce

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

places his protagonist on the threshold of becoming a man. The act of the beating itself by the pandybat, as well as even the jokes in the playground of punishment, mark a change to the boys through pain and suffering, however much it may be physical, Joyce here is utilizing as figurative for both the psychological as well. The protagonist has grown from a boy into a younger man or a boy into the initial threshold of manhood, but only by going through a system of rites. Moreover, the punishment dulled out that awakens his consciousness is done so to instill a social order, ripping out the formless child and placing their identity in that of a social order and not that of an individuated nature. In essence, the pandybatting can therefore be read as a means of social rite in which the students all go through to become full members of a group. Even more so, the event functions as a mark of initiation into adulthood: “Then we have to take into account the problem of the transformation of children into adults. That transformation is a fundamental concern throughout the ritual life of people. We have it today. There is the problem of turning ungovernable children, who express just the naive impulses of nature, into members of the society” (Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 113).

Just as Campbell remarks that the rites of passage of the individual are inherent to the progress of the child into the adult, some cultures are alluded to as having more of a physical mark upon the child to transform them physically, thereby also spiritually and mentally as well, he also notes that the physical punishment of it in actual modern terms has been reduced to a mere figurative stance. “As a Catholic boy, you choose your confirmed name, the name you are going to be confirmed by. But instead of scarifying you and knocking your teeth out and all, the bishop gives you a smile and a slap on the cheek. It has been reduced to that. Nothing has happened to you” (Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 112). Joyce utilizes this same imagery to have Stephen go through a physical transformation starting from the physical initiation into a mental maturation.

This aspect of becoming a “man” (for lack of a better terminology), through initiation rites is also underscored by Joyce’s return to the literary device of names. Stephen frequently will allude to the use of names in relation to his own character as a sign of foreshadowing transcendence into the protagonist reaching a new set point from which the character originated within the chapter. At the onset, though Stephen is first mortified as a boy participating in the adult world of discussion, he is left physically unharmed (therein, the same, intact character) but mentally horrified due to the inability to confront an adult world. Later, as he is pandybated, he is

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

physically mortified, as well as a mentally into a new Stephen who triumphs in his own self over adversity. This aspect is highlighted by the usage of the name allusion in which, while Stephen is on the threshold of becoming a new Stephen through confrontation with the rector, he criticizes himself for not being able to remember his own name when previously asked: “Why could he not remember the name when he was told the first time? Was he not listening the first time or was it to make fun out of the name?” (*P* 62) Joyce here is drawing upon the character as being nameless and also lacking personality; i.e., a character without a name has not attributes of their own. Prior to this point, Stephen lacks attributes of himself, merely being the parrot of those facts passed down to him or the setting proper. Such is the character of the child. Counterpoised thereof are names unmentioned of great men who have, through their accomplishments, been recorded in history (tantamount to having achieved their names as a character) of which Stephen has yet to accomplish little, reflected in his own self ridicule: “The great men in the history had names like that and nobody made fun of them. It was his own name that he should have made fun of it” (*P* 62).

Ultimately, the aim of the first two chapters is to give Stephen a name. In psychological terms, it would be to emboss his identity with a persona or ego. The culmination of the “pandybatting initiation” is as such, which Kimball notes as a means of demarcating the adult from the child self through the emergence of the persona and ego against the non-descript nature of the child: “We have only to recall the cruel incident at Clongowes with Father Dolan and the pandybat, as well as Stephen’s childishly heroic response to its injustice, to recognize both aspects of the archetype in *A Portrait*” (Kimball 49). These aspects she refers to are “the ‘first identification’ of the individuation process, which Jung describes as ‘typically an ‘abandonment’ or ‘misunderstood’ and unjustly treated’ figure with ‘overweening pretensions’. And Simon Dedalus’s deflating report of the rector’s response to Stephen’s heroic protest ... adds yet another stroke to the picture of this misunderstood child” (Kimball 49). Stephen’s constant reference throughout the novel of “it was unfair and cruel” (*P* 58) thereby acts as a harbinger of and marker of the emergence of the persona manifesting as it comes forth from the protagonist.

Joyce utilizes this epiphany to repeatedly underscore in a manner of ways to mark the instance in which the name and person of Stephen first arises from the child archetype, which becomes part of the narrative language of the protagonist as well. As Marvin Magalaner has pointed out, “Stephen, the embryo artist and rebel, will not ‘apologize’ even when the word

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

seeks to ‘pull out his eyes’” (179). Stephen never forgets this incident and carries it with him for the rest of the novel. Stephen seems surprised and deeply hurt that such injustice exists, repeating many times over the next few pages “it was unjust and cruel and unfair” (60). The idea and theme of justice and injustice is even supported and foreshadowed slightly earlier in novel, before this event of epiphany takes place. The pandybatting he received broke this illusion he had and became the starting point of an epiphany for him.

This epiphany can therefore be deemed as “retrospective”, often repeating itself in Stephen’s life when the cleavage between Stephen and the antagonism of the setting comes to peaks. For instance, when he is much older, his father meets the former rector in a pub and they both share a good laugh at Stephen’s actions (and expense) in regard to the beating: “By the buy, said Mr. Dedalus at length, the rector was telling me that story about you and Father Dolan. You’re an impudent thief, he said. – *I told them all at dinner about it and Father Dolan and I and all of us we all had a hearty laugh together over it. Ha! Ha! Ha!*” (P 81-2) The epiphany’s revelation does not come until he is in Bella Cohen’s brothel, when he realizes for the first time that there is an aspect of the church that can be obsessive and unjust: “The prefect of studies was a priest but that was cruel and unfair” (P 59).

Stephen is a protagonist whose true antagonism arises from the self. On his journey, he encounters no great challenges outside of his own making. There is no monster which destroys his family or villain he comes across that challenges him. If Stephen were to be torn dialectally between an antipodal nature of his protagonism (i.e., that which the character is aiming for) and antagonism (i.e., that which stifles the aim), it would be readily noted that he is but a wobbling top between the two, whose decisions eventually swing him out as a fulcrum gaining momentum. The cleavage between his loyalties to the setting and those to his individualistic nature wreck its own havoc on him as he emerges from the cocoon of himself. Where he goes between these two areas is the synthesis of these natures. Yet, as for the motivation or drive, it may only be remarked that he is trying to locate a point in the expanse of a chasm in which he may be torn no longer. Campbell frequently terms such a response one’s “bliss”. In moments of epiphany, Joyce has Stephen reach areas that bring him closer to a state of bliss, but do not leave him there. The end of the arc is therefore for Stephen to remain in his bliss, which is not the result of this novel, but recognition of the fact.

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

Campbell himself widely was known and oft reported to provide the advice of “Follow your bliss”. To his students, noting that, while it is a practical and insurmountable task, one still should “[F]ind where it is, and don’t be afraid to follow it” (*The Power of Myth* 286). Given his repeated affinity for Joyce, it follows that Stephen’s ability to find his own bliss would be the point of contention within the narrative as it involves an awakening. This itself is a process of which the character must first destroy in order to continue further. To illustrate, Campbell also cited that the mythological characterization of dragons as being beasts symbolic in their slaying allowed for the character to transform themselves as well as the environment. The dragon may be viewed as the antagonism by the protagonist encapsulated into a whole, whose demise is also resolution. Campbell goes one step further to link the psychological aspect of the dragon to the psyche where “the dragon is one’s own binding of oneself to one’s ego. We’re captured in our own dragon cage. The problem of the psychiatrist is to disintegrate that dragon, break him up, so that you may expand to a larger field of relationships. The ultimate dragon is within you, it is your ego clamping you down” (*The Power of Myth* 188). Stephen is driven by what he perceives to be his ego. Though this may change as he emerges into adulthood, the cage about which it is placed has itself broken free with every epiphany, thereby setting Stephen alight as a resolution.

Therefore, as soon as Stephen has undergone the process of slaying the first dragon through his confrontation with the unjustness of his education, the remainder of the novel follows Stephen in his tale of conquering the other “dragons” that subsume and cage his identity, which, as has been already noted, is a progression of perceived transgressions, their reflection, and epiphany in the end, marking closing structures to each chapter.

Albeit Stephen’s “dragons” are internal in their essence of conflict with the self, they frequently arise from his social settings or are inspired *per se* to culminate in a resolution to the inner conflict and, thereby, act as a means of address to the portrayal of social norms that seemingly conflict with Stephen’s inherent character of the infrequent social rebel or outsider. The constant juxtaposition of social order versus deviation mirrors the outsider seeking both acceptance and independence of said order. Such is Stephen in conflict, turning to and away the setting into which he is placed and struggling to find the unique character that shines through the two.

Joyce directly lays out this distinct conflict in Stephen within the first chapter not merely through childish confrontation, but by providing a commentary of the character’s hyper

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

consciousness of an order from which he is forged and from which he is driven to sever himself from – whether for better or worse. Hence, Stephen’s inscription into the flyleaf of his geography book, given in the first chapter, delineating place in the absolute order of the universe. Yet, the rub even here and within the greater extent of the novel is the danger that Stephen jeopardizes his own identity by being so extensively drawn out of the physicality and background of his character as to lose touch with his “roots”. Again citing the given description, the self-perception of Stephen as Joyce tears his character between the extreme, marks words that are abstract and go above and beyond those of a child. To put it differently, Joyce makes a character who, even in the unsculpted immature form, floats free from the physical cage he is situated in, yet at his own risk of having none which to call his home. Therein, Joyce also provides a counterpoint where Fleming writes another version to remind of the actual locality which does possess Stephen in spite of protestations or the apprehension of the protagonist. Hence – Stephen refers to his location as a series of places ascending in order according to magnitude, while Fleming’s undeniably asserts a repeated “my”, referring to Stephen’s.²⁵

25

*Stephen Dedalus
Class of Elements
Clongowes Wood College
Sallins
County Kildare
Ireland
Europe
The World
The Universe*

That was in his writing: and Fleming one night for a cod had written on the opposite page:

*Stephen Dedalus is my name,
Ireland is my nation.
Clongowes is my dwellingplace
And heaven my expectation. (P 17)*

4.3.3. *The Image of the Father Corroded - “A father, Stephen said, battling against hopelessness, is a necessary evil.”*²⁶

In *A Portrait* the archetypal structure of *father-son conflict* is in its rudiment, which will only later in what we call a sequel of *A Portrait – Ulysses*, transform and display its full nature in relationship with Bloom.

In relation to device of having Stephen write out and reiterate in rare occasion a delineation of his existence, Joyce seems to concern the portrayal of Stephen repeatedly with the latter’s placement into the setting and circumstances of certain actions, but always repeats the identity of Stephen within these contexts, even as they shift, or the character shifts. This usage itself may refer to a cultural aspect of the time of the novel itself, which is taken up by Borislav Knezevic as an interesting question in his article “Gentlemanly Ideology in *A Portrait of the Artist*”, asserting that when Stephen is posited about his father’s placement in society: “[t]he novel evokes much more than Stephen’s unease about his family’s dwindling status. It evokes an “English” term of distinction, certainly one of the key terms in which distinction had been articulated in nineteenth-century English society, and narrativized in the nineteenth-century English novel: the idea of the gentleman” (159).

This is to say that the time of which the novel was written also characterized an obsession of placement, particularly in terms of family and class order. This aspect only need be mentioned as Stephen further finds his own individuality through his family’s misfortune, or, in his arc, is able to remove himself from his family’s grasp to become an identity unto himself and not merely his family’s expectations.

The second chapter delves into this same concept further, revolving around the issue specifically of Stephen falling out of the social, life order that has been handed down to him. Opening with being taught to compete in races which he is unable to do despite an uncle’s friendly insistence, the issue comes to a head when Stephen travels with his father to Cork to resolve the selling of their family’s estate, where his father visits his old school and delights in relating advice and revelries to his son. On the way by train to Cork, Stephen is nothing but disdainful and reproachful to his father, eyeing only embarrassment and disconnect from him.

²⁶ Joyce, *U* 186.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

Such overt distance from his parentage is, up to this point, never so blatant as here, but it serves its literary purpose of splitting Stephen away into his own character. In the sense of a *bildungsroman*, here is the moment where the son begins to see the father as a mirror to his persona and not a father archetype that embosses the son as an idol, necessitating that Stephen's own character has matured beyond that of a child's.

In one section, Stephen reflects that “[h]is [Stephen's] mind seems older than theirs: it shone coldly on their strifes and happiness and regrets like a moon upon a younger earth” (*P* 108). The mere fact that Stephen is written to have a semblance of more maturity than his father's character signifies that there has been a transfiguration of Stephen. The removal he feels also denotes that he has emerged as a newer, independent self, after having individuated events prior. This sense of alienation and not belonging, while going through the separation, is particularly underlined by “images of the moon” (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 37). Such symbolism, in Campbell's elucidation, “accompan[ies] Stephen's feelings of separation from his father and his cronies. He [Stephen] is a dead satellite” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 37). The motif of the disillusionment of the child to the adult here marks a transformation of Stephen's character. Campbell is of the belief that the alienation that Stephen feels throughout is first addressed here, stating “a wasteland theme is beginning” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 37), and that Stephen, who is still a school boy, “is already in exile” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 37).

Of more import is even the recognition of the character to the new development of leaving one distinct period of life and entering another. Joyce specifically writes: “His childhood was dead or lost and with it his soul capable of simple joys and he was drifting amid life like a barren shell of the moon” (*P* 108). Not only does this suggest that Stephen's character now is distinctly set out to find his own meaning, as the innocence of childhood has been completely lost, Joyce again uses the moon as a reference symbol where Stephen is left to reflect on that which has passed but is unable to break free. The reflection of light comes off of Stephen as the sun to the moon, where the sun here is the father. As “the moon is usually thought of as ‘female’, primarily because of its passivity ... as the receiver of the sun's light” (Biederman 224), this also speaks of *the syszgy* of the *anima-animus* relationship that has been hereto discussed. Moreover, “the waxing and waning of the moon, and the inevitable return of the same lunar form, make a striking symbol for all philosophies combining death and rebirth” (Biederman 224). Based on the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

allusion to this metaphor, Stephen is ultimately undergoing a transformative birth that leaves him both dead and newly born. The end result is recognition of the distance as well as an acceptance of being separated from his parentage, and, by extension, his background: “He saw clearly too his own futile isolation ... He felt that he was hardly of the one blood with them but stood to them in the mystical kinship of fosterage, fosterchild and fosterbrother” (*P* 108-9). The epiphany that marks the character hereafter divorces Stephen from his lineage as to assign him one of his own making which lies in aestheticism. He is now left to become his own person and not the overbearing image of either mother or father. This archetypal material, presented, or more precisely hidden, in this section primarily evokes the Moses motif of abandoning the father image or association, but not distinctly that yet of the mother.²⁷

These epiphanic moments which occur throughout Stephen’s narrative transform the ego aspects of the character, which is to say that Stephen’s representation of who he considers himself to be, or at least its outwardly portrayed expression of the character’s development, receive momentary purges which allow it to be reformed. Campbell terms this as “the deluge motif: an annihilation of the ego system” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 37) as the ego is integral to the self but merely a representation of it, when the ego is subsumed by knowledge of the total self, it is not destroyed but renewed by this same revelation.

²⁷ Otto Rank in *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero* details the child’s sense of being adopted as a primary reaction to the sole authority image of the parent-child relationship. By default then, they are also “the source of all faith” (64). Consequently, the father to son and mother to daughter act as the progenitor of the child: “to grow up like father or mother, this is the most intense and portentous wish of the child’s early years” (Rank 64). Through intellectual development, the child eventually recognizes other adults or authority figures unlike their own parents, by which the essential idolatry of the parent transforms into a rebellion where the source of the rejection is the original source of emulation; i.e., that which was once seen to be modeled is now rejected as the default other. Such confrontation between the child and the parent are underscored when discord arises: “Trifling occurrences in the life of the child, which induce a mood of dissatisfaction, lead up to a criticism of the parents, and the gathering conviction that other parents are preferable in certain ways, is utilized for this attitude of the child towards the parents. ... The feeling that one’s own inclinations are not entirely reciprocated seeks its relief in the idea, — often consciously remembered from very early years, — of being a stepchild, or an adopted child” (Rank, 64). Sexually, this same discord manifests differently, as the rejection of one’s model also awakens the desire to subsume the other in a Freudian, Oedipal sense, by which it signifies the release of the child into a more intellectually capable individual. “The influence of sex is already evident, in so far as the boy shows a far greater tendency to harbor hostile feelings against his father than his mother, with a much stronger inclination to emancipate himself from the father than from the mother” (Rank 64). If Rank is to be applied to this assertion and, by extension the same to *A Portrait*, Stephen also rejects his father at the same moment he becomes sexually active as a matter of independence of the self from the family. In support of the emergence of Stephen, there are some synchronicities found on an autobiographical basis in one of the many letters he wrote to his beloved Nora Barnacle. In particular, stands his letter of August 29, 1904 when he wrote: “My brothers and sisters are nothing to me. One brother alone is capable of understanding me” (qtd. in Ellmann, *JJ* 169).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

When Joyce engages the reader in Stephen’s epiphanic moments culminating the experiences held usually in the form of a newly added layer as has been noted to advance the character, these come with equally descriptive areas of lucidity that pry into the essential nature of the character. The archetypal motif of the deluge is the flood that washes away the pretenses of attached aspects of the self as if to cleanse it or to return to a primary source. Eliade links the literal concept of the flood to the metaphoric where “the idea of humanity returning to the water whence it had come” (*Patterns in Comparative Religion* 210) also leads to the establishment of a new identity. Albeit Eliade references this in the cyclical nature of the understanding of time, in psychological sense, the individual also returns to the base to start anew. In literary terms, this is mirrored primarily in the archetypal character of the hero’s journey, where the essence of the character is stumbled upon during the events that the hero passes through, which allow or force the character to confront their true nature by returning to the essence of their being and not those associated qualities which have been assigned to them. Eliade also lends support to Joyce’s specific usage of allusion to the moon for Stephen whereby its cycles are found in mythology to converge with “themes of floods and deluges; for the moon is by far the most important symbol of rhythmic development, of death and resurrection. Just as the phases of the moon govern initiation ceremonies-in which the neophyte ‘dies’ to waken to a new life” (*Patterns in Comparative Religion* 210). Joyce uses the father archetype therefore as a means of metaphor for Stephen to reflect onto his own self by which a realization of his distinct nature apart from his father occurs and permits him to receive the inundation of this same revelation to expand as a character through a deluge of the self. Stephen will be left different while coming out of this plot point.

Nearing the end of the chapter though sees him in typified self-remorse after having put his father’s life into a contextualization, allowing Stephen to relate to his father’s context of having hoped to be “bloody honest good Irishman” (*P* 104) which his father proclaims. This merely serves to only partially stave off the ultimate rejection of his father by the end, even if there is some allusion made to Stephen’s understanding of his father in his father’s context and not his own. Moreover, the placement of the father character and archetype as one as not being the actual father whom Stephen is unable to relate to and only allows for the reader to see what Joyce would later call in *Ulysses* that “[P]aternity may be a legal fiction. Who is the father of any son that any son should love him or he any son?” (*U* 186), which paints a richer picture of a

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

narrative that sees Stephen as an individual and not part of a group. The epiphany thereof functions as one in which Stephen may be presented in a naturally occurring motif as “oneself against the group” which is transformed internally into “I and not I”, where Stephen takes a step further in his arc to find his true self.

Stephen is crafted as a character repeatedly facing challenges that directly affect his own understanding of himself and his place within the setting provided. The excursion with his father plays no small part of this in which Stephen avoids probable entrapment (akin to that discussed in *Dubliners*) of succumbing to the archetype of the father particularly in emulating their image. The episode here is needed in order to underscore Stephen’s growing detachment from the setting he has emerged from, particularly his father. As with the conflict of the pandybat where Stephen emerges as a person of his own, here this event further develops him as his own species set against his family and country – which becomes a main point of antagonism thereafter. As each of these epiphanies enriches his character and progress the architecture of the narrative, they also serve to break the story into the direction of an examination of previously established aesthetics. The novel, after this episode with the father, turns to larger ideas outside merely the individual or the family. Instead, it delves into aesthetics, against which, Stephen, true to his character, also struggles to grapple with.

The progression thus far is used to illustrate Stephen as being out of joint with the time and place he is set. More aptly, it serves as introduction to the artist as to emanate from Stephen hereafter. Campbell reflects on the alienation of Stephen’s character on terms of a lack of appreciation, where the character comes to feel as if they do not belong, which itself damages his self-image (see *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 7). In order to compensate a desire to have or seek power develops, “and we see in him [Stephen] the notion of his power to bring order into his life. That is what lies behind his strong estheticism: an aesthetic urge to organize a field – the field, first, of the work of art, but then the field, also, of his own life” (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 7). The tales the reader is taken on of Stephen’s childhood therein accommodate the aesthetic turn the book concludes on, as it is Stephen’s recompense to his sense of disaffection.

Albeit Stephen fits the motif of the outsider, especially as concerns estrangement placed on his character throughout the narrative, this moment of departure from his father marks the break in which he finally cements this attitude. Beyond the fact that Stephen is presented as one

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

unlike others, his family seems to him to be most distant, even a reminder of their existence comes to be a baneful point for the character. However, this episode serves the overall arc as Stephen being able to reflect in this chapter on his insistent self-isolation. As Peake has noted that “[t]he presence of his father and his cronies reminiscing produces an even more acute sensation of spiritual death” (72). Stephen, nor Joyce, may merely disengage themselves from their existence, nor, for that matter, the arc which Joyce endeavors to form for the character. For this reason, “the sense of loss of identity is so strong that he [Stephen] has to say to himself his name” (Peake 72), or rather, Joyce has Stephen reiterate as to point out that the understanding of the character here has changed to one that is disengaged from his family. Delineating his place within a context, note how Joyce makes a distinction of Stephen and Simon as two individuals, not merely his father as he is his son, but his father with a name as his own person: “I am Stephen Dedalus. I am walking beside my father whose name is Simon Dedalus. We are in Cork, in Ireland. Cork is a city. Our room is in the Victoria Hotel. Victoria and Stephen and Simon. Simon and Stephen and Stephen. Names” (P 105).

In terms of Jungian archetypes, Stephen has individuated his distance from his father figure by acknowledging their specific locale of mere existence and not that of the relationship alone. By sacrificing the sacred to focus on the profane, Stephen is made to become more a part of his surroundings than that of a mere son. By extension, Joyce here utilizes the conflict between the father and son motif to represent “the image of the father [that] is corroded” (Van Ghent 174-5). Thereby adding illustration to the subtext of Stephen’s disassociation with society as a whole, in which “Simon appears to the boy’s despairing judgment as besotted, self-deluded, irresponsible – and with the corruption of the father-image his whole picture of society suffers the same ugly damage” (Van Ghent 175). It is no accident thereof that Stephen begins on arc of disassociation with his settings from this point onward. Associating the projection of the *animus* of his father’s character with the society he stems from as a whole.

Furthermore, the epiphany reached in the chapter, as so denoted by this context, is that even though Stephen is at first hesitant to be recognized as his father’s son, seeing it as an anathema to his own identity and existence, by the end, he has accepted that though he may be, the context and result need not be the same, even if they share in the same origin. Instead, he replaces this identity with the outsider, the other, “one of his own kind”. Jung would note that this mirrors his claim that “[O]ne form of life cannot simply be abandoned unless it is exchanged

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

for another” (*MDR* 166). This first explicit assigning of Stephen as now external to his circumstance and not integral to it cements two distinct character traits that hereafter are carried forwards and inherent to the character: 1) Stephen considers himself to not be of his environment; 2) Stephen is now an independent thinker in whole who can counteract antagonisms with his own deliberations. These two traits important for character development are hereafter utilized in scope to tear Stephen further away through instances of triggers which come in the form common instances of the everyday. However, the resolution comes in the form of a solid decision, separating Stephen, generally through use of other triggers as to symbolize the demarcation of the character from the initial of the chapter. Within the second chapter, for instance, when he encounters a prostitute, albeit it only functions temporarily, reconciliation with his “outsider” nature, this is the remaining form of the novel from this point, where, as Peake comments “at the end of each chapter there is a similar transfiguration, a similar new world or new life” (73). While the same transformation is continued into the next, each chapter adds its own revelation or epiphany which Stephen is pulled between. This action continues to the point in which he grows too much the outsider to recognize his roots by the end of the novel.

This reflects upon the greater aspect of the chapter which paints Stephen as an outsider from the other characters presented within his setting. While the chapter is marked with an open accusation of heresy against Stephen only to be rebuffed when he makes a minor correction from reach to approach, it is pertinent to the painting of the character who seems to be cast against a setting of which the protagonist is either made to have trouble associating with or actively endeavors to disassociate himself from. The conflict that arises is that Stephen has no home, again alluded to in the changing of house, which interludes the chapter. Here, even though it is but the motif of the hero trying to find their place in the world, Joyce is narrating a story of escape from the world presented. Stephen’s need of isolation is insisted upon (“he began to taste the joy of his loneliness” [*P* 77]) as to delineate the aesthetic means by which the protagonist breaks free of the world by investing themselves into the divine. Much like a monk or hermit, disassociation between the corrupting that is inherent to the everyday, and the sacred that is only derived from within, Stephen is naturally forced to go inward as to escape the torment of the world around him. The pull of the opposite to what is expected of him, as well as the eventual yielding, the repentance, and the cycle of return all encompasses this active progressive state of disassociation with the state of belonging to Ireland, to his home, to discover who Stephen is.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

Consequently, at moments of peak clarity or epiphany, the revelation is sublimated again by the natural obstacle of prior belonging.

In the latter half of the work, the word “sin” is frequently used to designate a characteristic of the protagonist with which he actively struggles after having given into it. Though there be triggers that both make him “sin” and repent the “sin”, “sin” would seemingly eventually prevail between the two as these actions are those which tend to lead to his disassociation with his respective setting and an association with an inner-self. In Jungian terms, accessing the sin would appear to make the entire self in Stephen more whole as it addresses the shadow archetype which surfaces upon the “sinning” though exclusively after an epiphany has been reached. “Sin” *per se* is an interesting term to be used by Joyce as a sin is a unique individual aspect of one’s character even though it shares in a nature by which all may be corrupted. Jung goes so far as to state that only through sin one can achieve higher grace: “The meaning of sin is that it teaches humility; the Church says, *felix culpa*” (qtd. in Ostrowki-Sachs, *Conversations with C.G. Jung* 29). The sin that is to be repented when the shadow manifests in conscious thought ultimately is the unconscious, which permits redemption of the shadow’s desires (see Jung 192; vol. 9, pt. 2). While there are many methods of sinning and differing levels of “sin”, Stephen nor Joyce is concerned with the level of damnation, but the corruption of the self, whatever is viewed as at the time of “sinning”. Stephen’s sins early on, particularly upon his first visit to a prostitute, are related as being entirely sexual. These aspects are crucial as Stephen’s sinning nature denotes a shift in the novel where it is of himself and not that of another; i.e., the novel begins to explore the sheer protagonist in his own struggles against himself more than those of his environment. To wit, this aspect is again of note as Stephen’s sexual encounters are both of an individual nature (the act of having intercourse being of two individuals) as well as that of a uniform nature, mirroring Stephen’s motivation to better come to terms with his self. This follows as, in respect to sexuality; Jung remarked that “[it] is of the greatest importance as the expression of the chthonic spirit. That spirit is the ‘other face of God’, the dark side of the God-image” (*MDR* 168). Along these lines, sex is symbolic of awakening the other hidden side of the nature of the self to merge with it into a whole self. The sex and the sin of Stephen both elicit this Jungian motif *syzygy*²⁸, “the archetypal form of the divine syzygy”

²⁸ According to Claire Douglas “the anima–animus syzygy, were inspired in part by F. W. von Schelling’s (1775–1854) impassioned philosophy of nature, his concept of the world-soul which unified spirit and nature, and his idea

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

(Jung 67; vol. 9, pt.1) therein of the *anima* to *animus*. “Emotionally charged content is lying ready in the unconscious and springs into projection at a certain moment. This content is the syzygy motif, and it expresses the fact that a masculine element is always paired with a feminine one” (Jung 65; vol. 9, pt. 1). When Stephen engages in sexual intercourse with the prostitute after his disassociation with his father, the character reaches an epiphany but is expressed in Jungian terminology and associated literary symbolism where the protagonist unites with an opposite to merge into a newly developed character. In fact, this same removal of the self from the social sphere and social persona, involve sex throughout the novel. As Peake comments that “the phantoms which draw Stephen away from the aims and services urged upon him by society are sex fantasies” (Peake 72), they remain sexual as these are instances in which Stephen is quite obviously forming into a different character by uniting with opposing concepts. The syzygy of the *anima/animus* also reflects the antagonism Stephen faces when encountering his self.

For Jung, the *anima* is psychologically linked to the male as the aspect of the self which mirrors the conscious persona of the *animus*. For this reason, the *anima* deals with that which is counter to the *animus*. As the *animus* functions in harmony with the ego, the *anima* operates conversely: the *anima* “intensifies, exaggerates, falsifies, and mythologizes all emotional relations with his work and with other people of both sexes. The resultant fantasies and entanglements are all her doing” (Jung 70-71; vol. 9, pt. 1). When applied from a literary standpoint, the *anima* serves as the reflection of Stephen’s inner desires and motives which remain sublimated despite frequent mention or evidence of their escape. Jung would also note that when the *anima* comes to a forefront of interaction with the *animus*, it could lead to “a state of ‘discontent’ and spreads all around him [the *animus*]” (71; vol. 9, pt. 1). As Stephen emerges within the text in his struggles, he grows more discontent as he comes to know the *anima* aspect of his self better.

The prostitute signifies the opposing view of Stephen to himself which has plagued him from even the onset in which he must apologize for the wants and desires that constitute his own self differentiated from that which antagonizes them. By giving into these, the sense of separation in which Stephen is presented as being of two independent minds or bodies also ends

of the polarity of masculine and feminine attributes as well as our fundamental bisexuality. Von Schelling, like the other Romantic philosophers, stressed the dynamic interplay of the opposites in the evolution of consciousness” (25).

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

within the novel. Here, he is no longer a parroting boy but one who can stand alone as a character, which is done through integration with the other: “[t]he synthesis is constituted here by a triumphant integration of the dream of Mercedes with the encounter with the whore. It is ‘sin’ that triumphs, but sublimated as an ideal unity, pure and gentle and beautiful and emotionally securing” (Van Ghent 175). By giving into his sins, Joyce has Stephen figuratively begin to reconcile his conscious and unconscious spheres. This is also referenced by the motif of forbidden fruit as represented throughout by female characters as the *anima* to the *animus* of Stephen. Here it is the prostitute, but it is also Mercedes in his childish fantasies of escape, Emma as a child as the other, the bird girl as an adult who is both carnal and aesthetic temptation. The prostitute here is the most base and primal of figurative meanings in the motif of initiation wherein the boy becomes a man by going through a rite of passage. As with the outset of the section in which Stephen is flippantly relegated and forgiven of heresy, and underscored by the distance established to familial background, it concludes with “to sin with another of his kind” (*P* 113) as to establish the divorce between the two and open the path for Stephen to become *the artist*.

Nevertheless, even though this “mask” of up-here-to-boyhood would seemingly be shed through unity of the denied opposite, the self-doubt from “the shadow” shall prove the new counterforce to Stephen. After this “[sexual] initiation” (50), as Kimball terms it, the sense of rejection remains of his self. The reconciliation of Stephen with his own self and his origins is the final obstacle for him to overcome, which will not be rectified until “The Odyssey” portion of *Ulysses* is concluded.

4.3.4. The Transformation of the Sin into Self-knowledge

A novel of the time and place on which it reflects, *A Portrait* continually returns to religion, more specifically the Catholic church, as a factor in the protagonist’s development. Albeit present throughout the novel, and acting as a source of antagonism if not an ultimate derived source of his struggles, the final break from his societal background into the artist comes from the Church, which does also stand for society as well. Oddly, the moment of progression in Stephen’s arc for when he decides that he is unlike those of his surroundings is also when he

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

begins to reject himself. Taking up the sin as symbolized through patronizing prostitutes or engaging in acts unbecoming a true “Irish gentleman” foreshadows a moment of crisis and resolution whereby Stephen as quickly takes up the mantle of becoming “sin-free” by throwing his entire character into the Church as abandoning the idea. The epiphany that occurs here is one in which he is shaken from earthly bounds of materialism and awoken into the spiritual level. It is therefore the fundamental epiphany that solidifies the character as its own.

The *bildungsroman* itself has the literary issue of how does the author present the progress of the child to the adult in the human experience. Simple though it may seem to tell a story of how a boy has turned into a man or that of a girl into a woman, *A Portrait* is not asking how youth turned into an adult but how the artist in the boy came to be. Therein, the novel tried to aim beyond the concept of the physical and takes an inward journey of the spiritual, which the note upon which the novel comes to rest.

The separation from the worldly to the spiritual, or here let it now be referred to as the aesthetic, occurs to Stephen in much the same way as those epiphanies prior in which he is torn asunder from previous suppositions handed to him or tacitly accepted, to reject them, but be transformed by the process. Here where Stephen begins a rejection of the church as well as a path it may take him also allows him to reflect on the space through which he has passed and find that which is himself remaining. This reflection though only comes after being pushed into an aesthetic sphere after having rejected bonds of the materialistic and societal as these latter are physical, but the aesthetic journey explores inward into the self and not opposed against the other.

As Joyce paints Stephen into a corner of crisis with the Church, which he has already illustrated as not being able to see eye-to-eye on, it leaves Stephen in a position in his character development by which he may examine an aesthetic nature of being and confront it. Although this confrontation may not lead to an entire awakening of the character as *artist*, it lays the foundation in the same manner those epiphanies prior do. What distinguishes the epiphany when confronting the self’s spiritual nature is that it cannot be left unchanged since it has been swallowed whole by the expanse of the experience. Campbell denotes this as the mystery of the self, which Stephen is now ejected into. “It is a *mysterium*, a mystery, *tremendum et fascinans* -- tremendous, horrific, because it smashes all of your fixed notions of things, and at the same time utterly fascinating, because it’s of your own nature and being” (*The Power of Myth* 55). In the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

progression of the protagonist for whatever narrative, being baptized by falling into the self and encountering the spiritual is a motif where the protagonist can neither return nor see the world as the same place as before.

The freedom of recognizing himself as the archetypal motif of *the other* is quickly transformed into shame which Stephen feels he must escape from. Such an action could be interpreted in many ways as a “refusal of the call”²⁹, a stage in a hero’s journey where he or she renege on the newly found transformation he or she have gone through due to the complete wasteland encountered by abandoning the old and accepting the new. Frequently, the revelation is misinterpreted, which happens to Stephen who, now as a self-found outsider, projects this as sin instead of otherness. The *refusal of the call* need not ultimately result as a negative feature, however, since “the predicament following an obstinate refusal of the call proves to be the occasion of a providential revelation of some unsuspected principle of release” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 64). In other terms, the hesitation need not result in a paralytic character as is found in *Dubliners* but may offer the pause and reflection needed, as well as the base transformation to be established, for the hero to make the journey properly as opposed to metaphorically setting out to soon on a fool’s errand before even the hero has come to know what is in for or the motivation which drives him.

In effect, the rejection permits the void which has come to hold place over what has already been abandoned to be filled through a sense of revelation by an inward movement of the psyche in which an inner state of knowledge may come to surface. For this reason, Campbell notes that the rejection is a universal in all narratives but “cannot be described, quite, as an answer to any specific call” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 64) since the call itself is an immaterial process in which the story begins to transform the character. Instead, Campbell considers the rejection as a transformative process, marking an event that comes to define the character as emerging into one on the threshold of realization. Campbell therefore urges the reader to examine the call as “a deliberate, terrific refusal to respond to anything but the deepest, highest, richest answer to the as yet unknown demand of some waiting void within” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 65). The rejection, in essence, removes or distances the character from its mere association into the actual revelation of who the character is. When this is established

²⁹ For more on the substantive nature of the refusal as an integrated step on the hero’s path see Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 64.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

clearly “some power of transformation carries the problem to a plane of new magnitude, where it is suddenly and finally resolved” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 65).

In the case of Stephen, he transfers his new-found freedom of being hindered less by his social persona into a sense of shame and guilt. While this stems from the prior engagement of sin acting as liberator to the other for Stephen’s separation from his family, instead of directly following the route of other as has been posed to him, the actions he has undertaken receive a crisis of shame. The acceptance and rejection of sin, however do serve to illustrate the freeing nature of sin to lead to the aesthetic as his end, or, to *clarity* as Stephen would justify it as a reflection upon the total of its parts. For this reason, the sin crisis of the novel plays a crucial part, as it allows for Stephen to reject what he first sees in himself to come to terms with that which ultimately surfaces, but none of it is what he originally intends.

The sin is used as a literary motif to mark Stephen first as the other and then to repent the fact. The engagement of prostitutes, for instance, which we are lead to believe is the primary source for when Stephen feels shame of his “sin” is therefore not just a rite of passage but serves as the *anima* and *animus* combining to form a whole, which has been thus discussed. While Joyce has not written Stephen into feeling an expression of any shame in regards to his actions beforehand that is self-internalized (i.e., not stemming from others where Stephen is forced to feel a sense of guilt that is not *sui generis* - they will “pull out his eyes” not he shall “pull out his own”) there is a clearly written motif of the hero’s self-realization but against that which has led him thus far on his journey. The danger therein lies that he shall retreat and not reach an end if he goes back on what he has discovered or misinterprets it. This is the point in the novel where, to use Campbell’s words, “a radical shift”³⁰ occurs, but is most delicate as it is prone to miscomprehension.

The initial pivot to the theme of guilt is made through Stephen’s reactions to Father Arnall’s sermons, where he is implored to “Confess! Confess!” He has come to mortal sin, he feels, “by seeing or by thinking of seeing” (*P* 159) and the fault thus lies in his “eyes” which “see the things, without having wishes first to see” (*P* 159), referring to the sense of superimposed guilt from the outset of the novel. Yet, leading up to this crisis is an entire personalized history of

³⁰ Campbell notes and includes what is one of the recognizable means in Joyce’s narration, not only of *A Portrait*, but as well as his other works. What occurs, according to Campbell, is a “new life”, the birth and spiritual awakening of a persona in order that the process of transformation can be ensured. Afterwards, the hero shall be able to accomplish further steps enabling continued progression in the process of individuation.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

events within his life that directly counter-argue the church’s influence especially in social terms.

At the first experience of sin, Stephen has already been cast aside from the social norms of the good Irish gentlemen in his own mind. Through sheer extension, he concludes of belonging to the archetype of the other. To this end are the statements given that “he wanted to sin with another of his kind, to force another being to sin with him and to exult with her in sin” (P 113). The astute reader will note that there is no hint of romance or idealized forms within this passage, rather a surrendering to carnal desires that serve to distinguish the nature of the physical and the aesthetic spiritual from one another: “with a sudden movement she bowed his head and joined her lips to his and he read the meaning of her movements in her frank uplifted eyes. It was too much for him. He closed his eyes, surrendering himself to her, body and mind, conscious of nothing in the world but the dark pressure of her softly parting lips” (P 115). There is again an allusion to the eyes, but here it stands to represent a rejection of even a witness to the event, succumbing to only pleasure. Were his eyes open, it might prove acceptance, instead this underscores the physical nature of the event and not the aesthetic which Stephen will arrive at later when he witnesses the sea-bird girl bathing in the river which he holds sacrosanct.

Stephen Dedalus is born into a religious Catholic family and is brought up within the confines of the Irish Catholic Church which Joyce chooses to paint as a suffocating force within society. Despite this epithet, it is from the church which Stephen and Joyce received their education. It would only serve then that a climatic crisis emerge between Stephen and the Church, setting Stephen a degree freer, but here mentally in the construct of his own character. Until the conflict arises within Stephen judging his own character which is sparked by the Church, the patronage of prostitution remains “essentially bestial, radically foreign to his concept of himself as well as contradicting his Persona” (Kimball 50). In other terms, it may be gleaned that Stephen’s character is written as only gaining a sense of separateness from his background, not one that allows him to move onward in terms of establishing a character whose view of the world has been significantly changed as to establish a new understanding. Therein lies why the Church acts as a countermeasure within the novel as to awaken Stephen’s mental prowess despite the antagonism between the two. Kimball specifically notes that Stephen is awoken into the light due to this conflict in which he must somehow abide for his sins. The hellfire he envisions acts as the trigger for the discovery “contrary to his fears, that ... he lives in a dark,

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

cold world, even before he retreat sermons shatter the dark place” (Kimball 50). Yet, since hereto in the novel he has already grown distant from the majority of factors within his associated environment, it is only by using imagery related to his mental cognition “associated with the church beliefs that have been a dominant developmental guide throughout all his life” (Kimball 50), that the character obtains a truly “vivid picture” (Kimball 50) of the self as opposed to merely glimpses of being the other.

To re-summarize, only through confronting his own mental faculties, which is presented as his education through the church, can Stephen cease being a character who is defined by his self-perceived and professed otherness, but take on a character all of his own as the protagonist set free from his own limitations and boundaries. Therein, notwithstanding the act itself, the transition of Stephen’s so called perverted and deviant sexual life serves to underscore the epiphany which leads him to a transformation into *the artist*. Whereas he engages in these sexual acts as a means to escape whereby, he suddenly is exposed to a crisis of conscience from which he emerges with a new aesthetic concept that frees him from his own judgment and that of others into a sense of recognition of his Jungian self; i.e., who he is in total.

It is no accident that when Stephen has become complacent in his frequenting of bordellos, he is lectured on the finer points of Hell by Father Arnall. The event itself arises when Stephen’s character is at danger of not advancing further since his otherness may be all that encompasses his character, not one unique to him; i.e., Stephen is in danger of becoming that which he defines himself against, not as, thereby becoming something which is not his own self. Moreover, to do so, Stephen must first undergo a process of epiphany so as to escape the depths which the rejection into otherness has led him while still retaining the individuality he has gained from a liberation of being part of the other. Campbell asserts that Stephen “is suddenly struck with the realization of the degradation of the life he has been leading” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 42). However, this degradation should not be seen as being brought down to a morally impure level, but where Stephen has not been able to find himself while giving into the fancies of the flesh while ignoring the more substantive intellectual aspects of his character. The amplification of the image of hell for him is given as one of the flesh, but Stephen invariably interprets it as one of mental anguish. As Campbell also notes, “[H]is life is amplified into a hell image, the one image the Church has to give that really does something to Stephen, and that image is so fierce, it transforms his character” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 42). From its

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

outset then, the sermon on hell has little to do about the spiritual belief of the place, but is a metaphor to serve the motif of the hero going through a transformative process.

In order to establish this basis, Joyce writes the description of “hell” in such a manner that it is to contrast with the actual reality that Stephen purports to the events in his real life. The actual physical attributes of hell are not to be found in the sinful places where Stephen himself goes. Although the transformation initiates with the shock and panic at the vivid visions of hell presented by Father Arnall, where a sensuous description is provided, it paints a picture rather through the association of being left with other sinners in a state of torment:

Hell is a strait and dark and foul-smelling prison, an abode of demons and lost souls, filled with fire and smoke. ... The horror of this strait and dark prison is increased by its awful stench. All the filth of the world, all the offal and scum of the world, we are told, shall run there. ... Imagine all this and you will have some idea of the horror of the stench of hell. (*P* 135-137)

It is essential to underscore that the description as being a place where the worst of the world are forced to dwell as it is the most common theme that Arnall turns to since the physical nature is not matched. When Arnall notes that there is not light in hell, but only heat, Stephen’s recollection of visiting a brothel offers ample amounts of light. Indeed, if this passage is contrasted with the earlier description of the visiting of the brothel area, it clearly counters the description of hell in many ways, save for the relegation of being assigned to the sinner who cannot see the light. As opposed to the direct nature of hell where one is forced to be stuck, Stephen does not follow the road straightly but in curves. The smells are perfumed as opposed to the stench. Clearly, Stephen’s sin or hell does not lie here in physical means, regardless of the immense shame he feels directed towards it after the fact:

After early nightfall the yellow lamps would light up, here and there, the squalid quarter of the brothels. He would follow a devious course up and down the streets, circling always nearer and nearer in a tremor of fear and joy, until his feet led him suddenly round a dark corner. The whores would be just coming out of their houses making ready for the night, yawning lazily after their sleep and settling the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

hairpins in their clusters of hair. He would pass by them calmly waiting for a sudden movement of his own will or a sudden call to his sin-loving soul from their soft perfumed flesh. Yet as he prowled in quest of that call, his senses, stultified only by his desire, would note keenly all that wounded or shamed them. (P 115).

It is quite evident from Joyce’s use of description that hell is not found in the actual act, but in the fact that Stephen, through the association of not travelling beyond that original concept of “other”, is sinning and in hell. He is one of the prisoners “heaped together in their awful prison” (P 136) who “are not even able to remove from the eye a worm that gnaws it” (P 136). In more modern terms, a popular psychologist would say that by letting himself feel at ease in such surroundings, he is not living up to his potential. This is evidenced by the shared concept of being lost or the aimless attitude that permeates both descriptions. Stephen has no bearing as to where he is going even when his character has been liberated from the trappings of family and society. His mental fortitude though offers no respite without being tempered within the fires of “hell”. He is at risk of not being able to overcome those around him to reach his own identity, but being trapped in a hell of their own and his own making with them. The horrors and shock striking Stephen result in first being stricken by the fear of an inability to escape the prison built around him, but it is misinterpreted as needing to find this salvation within the confines of the Church’s liberation. This is ironic due to the fact that the Church itself has proven another prison to Stephen until this point. Apart from educating him, it has offered no path for Stephen to realize who he is. If anything, Joyce has taken pains to illustrate how confining the Church is. The final drive to confess and free himself from the sin is then “an analogous purging when he comes to confession in response to his more or less rational consideration of the disease of his soul” (Kimball 50). The disease is the motif of coming to terms with the shadow, specifically the aspects of the self which have remained under the surface but need to be brought to light and harmonized together.

Stephen has faced antagonism prior to the hell and sin crisis, but never a pure antagonism that originated within himself; instead, the objects of conflict either stemmed from external sources that reflected on Stephen or simply were external to him by which he had an epiphany about his relation to them. This happens no more. Stephen, in confronting his own nature and

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

conflicting with his own self, rises above the limited nature of his identity prior to the epiphany. Oddly enough, he would have to go through hell, so to speak, in order to do so. The sin, as has been noted, is an inherent internal flaw that needs correction and redemption, but leaves the sinner anew after. In relation thereof, as Jung notes on the concept of hell being subsumed by the sin, he also notes that it does not leave one entirely absorbed by one side of a duality, rather as languishing in it whereby consciousness can reach a new level in its escape. To arrive as such from this situation is to reach a total comprehension of *teleiosis*, which is to say to fulfill the nature of oneself. Reaching these states of epiphany allows for the *teleiosis* to be comprehended, to which Jung appeals that “empirically speaking, consciousness can never comprehend the whole, but it is probable that the whole is unconsciously present in the ego. This would be equivalent to the highest possible state of *τελείωσις* (completeness or perfection)” (Jung 110-11; vol. 9, pt. 2). The importance here then lie in the fact that Stephen emerges from “hell” as confronting his “sin” and biter reaching a state of *teleiosis*. For all intents and purposes, this here may be deemed that as the artist coming from the young man.

Since the result of this is the absconding from Ireland and a turning to the wings of art, it can be inferred that this interjection of removal from and acceptance of the sin is the epiphany which is subsequent to this emergence of the artist. The shadow that surfaces creates Stephen the artist through an acceptance of intellectual and aesthetic prowess. It would then seem that the sin which Stephen comes to terms with is actual his true aesthetic nature which has emerged from his education but is heretical and antithetical to it. Moreover, since the novel associates his mother at this point as being both the singular aspect within the family who he has not distanced himself from as well as being a symbol and stand in for the church, his epiphany shall distance himself from her likewise where she is transformed from the archetype of the mother as support to an overbearing archetype.

The conflict which Stephen faces in himself may be termed in the archetypal motif of drowning, which has been noted as being subsumed by knowledge of the self which leaves one powerless. The sin stands as an actual part of Stephen’s nature, but absorbed by rejection, he also defies his own wishes. As his path changes from that to a sinner where he wants for nothing more than his past deeds to be ejected from his life by any means necessary lest he succumb to a delusion of being captured by a state of inscape (i.e., hell) where he repeats the utterances to himself of “[N]o escape. He had to confess, to speak out in words what he had done and thought,

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

sin after sin” (P 143). The drive of such escape also would necessitate devout Catholicism, perhaps even entering the priesthood, which would equally result in blindly following religious doctrine, leaving Stephen blind to himself as well. The suggestion thereof where Stephen begins to abandon the actual essence of his life to be lost in a meditated desertion into is made apparent by Stephen’s “rule to walk in the street with downcast eyes, glancing neither to right nor left and never behind him. His eyes shunned every encounter with the eyes of woman” (P 171). Again, referencing the eyes as symbols into the self, Stephen here denies any part of the world to influence his self, delving into isolation from the actual world into that of the mind. Although this mirrors the aestheticism he takes up after refusing the call of the Church, the latter is not one of his own choosing or consequence but prescribed externally, obstructing Stephen temporarily until surrendering to the call of the former. To demonstrate the actual impediment of the acceptance of his life as his own will and choice where he may better find his own voice among others, Stephen notes to himself that he finally comprehends the world as “a plain of peace whereon antlike men labored in brotherhood” (P 143). This comes only after a rejection of the works of men in their lives and leads into a confession frenzy, underscoring the theme that Stephen is abandoning the world around him out of desperation but may be being misguided in that effort. This distinction is further contrasted after the rejection of religious fervor as Stephen lays out a theory of aesthetics that accept things for what they are in their totality (as in his own *teleiosis*) not by what they may be deemed as.

The repentance which Stephen is pulling himself through and the agony it creates does not resolve itself in the confession as it leads him only away from his identity. Instead, it leads him deeper into a spiral of despair in which he is depicted as wandering in a perplexity even with confession and reassurance of a life in the Church by Father Arnall. The confusion for Stephen is that after having broken from conventional influences, he must now be at odds with himself as *there is no other antagonism in his freedom than himself*. The church merely plays a backdrop to it and provides a form to the plastic nature of it. When finally facing the nature of his own actions, must resolve *the shadow*, literally in Jungian terms the archetype of what the conscious-self casts over the conscious yet remains unseen.

Coming to terms with the shadow requires admittance of the unknown but influences the self. By necessity, it is uncomfortable, even frightening since the conscious-self will be altered by merely the recognition of it, let alone its harmonization. The manifestation of the shadow *qua* the

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

self in terms of Stephen’s antagonistic development occurs in the dream sequence where his shadow contrasts his nature. Kimball remarks that the former is “represented as inhuman, literary monstrous, certainly in no way a part of Stephen’s personality” (50). It must be understood, however, that Joyce has laid out this sequence to contrast the imprisonment of hell with the dream creatures as a warning of the shadow to not let the self be imprisoned.

Joyce takes pains to depict the creatures in the most negative, derogatory forms possible, writing that they are “[g]oatish creatures with human faces, hornybrowed, lightly bearded and grey as india-rubber. The malice of evil glittered in their hard eyes, as they moved hither and thither, trailing their long tails behind them. A rictus of cruel malignity lit up greyly their old bony faces” (*P* 157). What is more, he places them into a barren, inhospitable, foreboding landscape of “stiff weeds and thistles and tufted nettle-bunches ... [where] [t]hick among the tufts and rank stiff growth lay battered canisters and clots and coils of solid excrement” (*P* 157). These creatures could easily be associated with the motif of the Devil who may be represented as half human and half goat-like (albeit, usually the head is the goat) or, perhaps more apt, the satyr who was associated with sexual potency, but here represented as feeble, weak, aging, and unable to even overcome the chains that leave them confined to their own hell. Joyce could here be argued to also be referencing Dante’s journey with Virgil through the circles of hell upon their entrance in which a beast pursues them to enter the abyss and only by doing so can he emerge enlightened through its escape.³¹

The exact reference or nature of the beasts need not be as important as their context. As related to Jung, who claims “[t]here are a great many of them [symbols], and all are individually marked by suitable shifts of meaning” (*Dreams* 108), the symbol itself within its context better determines its significance than a direct one-to-one comparison (obviously a remark against Freud’s interpretations). It can be here defined that these beasts function as being a warning to Stephen as well as a counterpart to what he could become if he allows himself to be denigrated into his own hell. They are used as a reference point within Stephen’s psyche’s stratification, wherein the dream is used to present the actual state of conflict as it is “more clearly discernable

³¹ “Thy soul is by vile fear assail’d, which oft
So overcasts a man, that he recoils
From noblest resolution, like a beast
At some false semblance in the twilight gloom.
That from this terror thou mayst free thyself”. (Dante, *Inferno* 46-50; Canto 2)

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

in the dream than in the conscious mind. In the dream, the psyche speaks in images, and gives expression to instincts, which derive from the most primitive levels of nature” (Jung, *Dreams* 108).

To this point, the monstrous creatures of his nightmare are reminiscent of Nietzsche’s meditation where he claims that what separates the human from the animal is a knowledge of existence within the past, present, and future, allowing the human to reason about their state of being. What is more, the nature of the beast does not allow for one to comprehend the true nature of one’s emotions, which is a human trait requiring reflection which the beast is incapable of.³²

Nietzsche notwithstanding, his reflection here is apt as to Stephen’s predicament. As the dream state rightly illustrates, the hell of the shadow that has been haunting him is not of his sin, but of not outgrowing it. The base natures of the beast, of the animal, threaten to override the aesthetic which will eventually be brought to resolution through his own revelation. Therein, the imprisonment is in danger of becoming the same. The shadow that follows him is of his own Irish identity (for lack of a better term). Logically, then, after passing through the hell of his making, he will grapple with accepting the shadow of his origins, which lines the incidents of the conclusionary sections of the novel itself.

Such a conclusion may be sussed out upon examination of the beasts, which are written as practically being an incoherent mess, lacking eloquent communication, heading towards nowhere, searching through randomness: “Soft language issued from their spittleless lips as they swished in slow circles round and round the field, winding hither and thither through the weeds, dragging their long tails amid the rattling canisters” (*P* 157). It would be pertinent to connect this description with that of the horse in “The Dead” whose circling was descriptive of the paralytic nature of that collection’s characters. Stephen, clearly frightened just as much as this vision as by that of hell, equates the two as one. It can be rightly inferred then that the hell is an imprisonment

³² “Consider the cattle, grazing as they pass you by. They do not know what is meant by yesterday or today, they leap about, eat, rest, digest, leap about again, and so from morn till night and from day to day, fettered to the moment and its pleasure or displeasure, and thus neither melancholy nor bored. ... A human being may well ask an animal: ‘Why do you not speak to me of your happiness but only stand and gaze at me?’ The animal would like to answer, and say, ‘The reason is I always forget what I was going to say’ – but then he forgot this answer too, and stayed silent” (Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations* 60).

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

from the nature of the flesh which he associates with his sin, but the actual sin which must be overcome is finding only the flesh as being acceptable and not reaching his *teleiosis*. Such a motif can be found here and elsewhere in the novel where Stephen must set himself free from his binds, but here it is himself in his physical nature and background that he confronts and actually is the backdrop for his crisis of faith in himself. Given this conflict, the shadow lies within the other concept of being left to associate only as a beast.

The actual nature of the sin as being merely figurative and not literal is best seen in Joyce's absence of the condemnation of the sin and found within the description of the object of the sin. When commenting on Stephen's secret hoard of pornographic photographs, Joyce writes that Stephen "has monstrous dreams, peopled by ape-like creatures and by harlots with gleaming jewel eyes" (P 131). It is of no small significance that the pictures are hidden away within the flue, associative of hell-fire, but covered in soot, clouding them over in the black of the figurative "shadow" so that they are muddied or unseen when out of their hiding place. Joyce even writes that Stephen "lay for hours sinning in thought and deed" (P 131), whereby his nature remains lazy in the acceptance of the other given to him prior, but no more than that. What is conspicuously glossed over is that there is nothing painted which is wrong with the physical act itself of giving into one's carnal desires, but the shame of the release into it without bettering the self. Based upon the revelation of surrendering to pure aesthetics later in the novel, this nature of his character is also in the shadow as he is not actively developing it owing to the fact that it requires he tear himself away further from even the other to find himself.

The creatures are therefore *the animae* mirroring the shadow itself and fill the role of an omen of what Stephen may become when rejecting his self for sin or reinterpreting the sin and its remedy incorrectly. Joyce ventures so far as to compare this to a disease from which he cannot escape: "The leprous company of his sins closed about him, breathing upon him³³, bending over him from all sides. ... [t]hough his eyes were shut fast, he saw the places where he had sinned and, though his ears were tightly covered, he heard" (P 156-7). Though the creatures are symbols of the inability to escape, the sin therefore serves as a cause to it, but one which cannot be atoned for simply by following the doctrine of the Church, which Joyce reiterates throughout the remainder of the novel as Stephen divorces himself from the church into his own views

³³ Note how these exact words "breathing upon" and "bending over him" Joyce will use in *Ulysses* for a vivid description of how the "ghost" of Stephen's dead mother is haunting him (see U 10).

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

(“aesthetics”) and from his mother who is a mirror *anima* to the church.

Although Stephen rejects outright the fear the sin may confine him to, Joyce has Stephen equally reject any recognition of the reality to it as well. Stephen lets his crisis lead him down a false path in which the reality of how he actually feels - here embodied by the shadow - is overshadowed by an external force, blinding him as much as the sole act of the sin and leading him to the same hell. Kimball characterizes Stephen’s repudiation of encountering full knowledge of the unconscious as not being “an uncommon way station in individuation” (50). Much like the characters of *Dubliners*, instead of acknowledging the strength of the shadow surfacing to make him aware of the issue, Stephen is giving into his social persona, as a way “to deny any value to the unconscious and ‘go on living reasonably’” (Kimball 50-1). In brief, Stephen’s foray of fantasy into a parochial life despite explicit misgivings is a way for him “to ‘reconstitute’ the Persona, and try ‘to forget if possible that one has an unconscious at all’. And Stephen’s confession, which concludes chapter 3, is in the first step in his determined effort to reconstitute the Persona he had abandoned” (Kimball 51).

The false ideation that initiates with the Church aims to squelch the shadow before it can reveal itself to Stephen. Although ready in crisis, Joyce writes Stephen into a figurative corner where the only option offered to escape is through the Church which would seemingly offer: 1) recompense to the sin; 2) a means of understanding the self through a new persona; and 3) a further education and academic development, which is the one constant in Stephen’s arc. At all three of these points, however, the Church fails to recognize the essence of the crisis. Neither the sin Stephen envisages is not the same as the Church’s, nor the persona or the education. The Church fails to take into account the actual concerns of the character, which can be readily seen by the reader, and ultimately acts as a catalyst to finalize Stephen’s persona.

The actual incongruity and alienation stemming from the church is best evidenced by how Joyce chooses to represent the Church through indirect self-characterization. Such depiction is best seen when Stephen speaks to a priest about joining the Jesuits. While Stephen does seriously listen to the director’s proposal, the offer to enter the priesthood is presented as a subtle parody of the traditional religious narrative of the spiritual journey towards salvation. Indeed, it mirrors the temptation of Christ where Stephen is promised all the power he could ever wish or imagine to receive – but only through the Church; the priest’s words invoking devil’s temptation

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

itself, offering no spiritual insight that Stephen actually strives for. There is something corrupt and materialistic about the power that Stephen is offered:

No king or emperor on this earth has the power of the priest of God. No angel or archangel in heaven, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself has power of a priest of God; the power of the keys, the power to bind and to loose from sin, the power of exorcism, the power to cast out from the creatures of God the evil spirits that have power over them, the power, the authority, to make the great God of Heaven to come down upon the altar and take the form of bread and wine. (*P* 179-80)

Never once is there mention of spiritual fulfillment or “knowing God” merely the ability to have power, which Joyce highlights with a gloating of pride. Despite the offer and reassurances of the priest, Stephen is led to an inexplicable restlessness.

As has been already noted, turning towards the Church was merely initiated by a crisis of perceived non-egress from the imposed hell Stephen had been castigated into by his own cognizance. However, when the Church which had insisted on the hell offers not even platitudes but their own dogma, Stephen and the reader are left lacking resolve from the actual “hell” crisis. It is this point in the novel that Stephen begins to come across the epiphany that will lead his mind to free itself from undue bondage, when the Church is transformed beyond the shadow of a doubt as a corrupting source rather than of liberation. This follows the same epiphanical patterns that have led to this crisis and its resolution.

Stephen decides that the Church offers nothing to resolve the hell he had envisioned, yet is merely another path towards it. It is the abrupt necessity for this decision that makes Stephen realize “the frail hold of which so many years of order and obedience had of him when once a definite and irrevocable act of his threatened to end forever, in time and in eternity, his freedom” (*P* 161-2). The freedom he mentions here is one of his own making and not the result of an imposed nature as he would find elsewhere; Stephen finally comes to an admission of wishing to be his own individual. In Jungian terminology, this is a revelation in which the total self, the *teleiosis*, is briefly brought in recognition of the conscious self.

When confronted by the dull and complacent existence offered to him by the Church in

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

which dogma triumphs over original thought, he also reflects on the freedom he will lose and the permanency of the decision he is about to make. “He was destined to learn his own wisdom apart from others or to learn the wisdom of others himself” (P 184-5). This rejection of the Catholic priesthood quickly leads Stephen to lose his faith; at the same time, it prepares him for the realization of his true calling – his aesthetics, to become the “priest of the eternal imagination, transmuting the daily bread of experience into the radiant body of everliving life” (P 252) as he later calls himself. Nevertheless, it is only first by being offered a means of escape that Stephen may do so. Kimball agrees on the pivotal nature of this event in the novel, stating that “Stephen’s joyful recognition of the freedom promised by his escape from the schoolboy world of the Jesuits into the world of the university, his freedom doubly ensured through his rejection of membership in the order” (Kimball 51). This disconnect finally marks Stephen’s ability to escape from his past boyhood into the future where he is a distinct individual with set ideas that he is responsible for making, not merely being an interpreter of the re-utterance of those in his surroundings.

The religious implications of Stephen’s first initiation into the thought of becoming a priest as well as the rejection of it serve as a backdrop for this penultimate epiphany in which he is able to confront himself removed entirely from his own surroundings and creation. The hellish fire in which he first envisions his soul is an archetypal motif of purification where the character is transformed through hellfire anew. Stephen clashes with the Church in spite of the true hell he recognizes, but the Church comes as tantamount to the same trappings of hell perceived. Thereby, the rejection, as soon as it has dawned upon Stephen, results in no-return, and the world itself has changed. Now, where there was doubt, there is only assurance – even though Stephen has not finished his arc or journey.

Stephen now need not challenge his own self, but find his own place within it. The conflict awaiting after he has assumedly found his self is to find how it fits into the world around him. Since his father in the novel grows increasingly distant and hostile from the outset to the end, Stephen has already broken with him, as has been discussed. Given that Stephen must find himself from the anathema of the Irish society he is in, and due to the fact that his mother has always represented the peacemaker and harmonizer against the logical backdrop of the father, it is she who will then be the final oppositional point to Stephen’s aims. She is the vast lake of water which otherwise swallows and which Stephen must swim out of. In Jungian terms, she is thereafter represented as the archetype of the encompassing mother whose love transforms her

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

into swallowing the child. Erich Neumann, one of the leading Jungian scholars, in his study *The Great Mother* offers a purview of “splitting up the archetype” (27) and in the same vein a negative aspect of a mother archetype, where psychological analysis refers to “the irruption of an archetype, e.g., the Terrible Devouring Mother, whose psychic attraction is so great because of its energetic charge, that the charge of the ego complex, unable to withstand it, ‘sinks’ and is ‘swallowed up’”, and this is where the conscious realization occurs (27). Any form of *anima* in the novel matches equally to one another – the Church, the Irish nation, and society - no matter if Joyce uses them as a reference point to epiphany or as a warning of confinement. These are written in Stephen’s biography as pitfalls and pratfalls in which he avoids the temptations and navigates the trials set against him. Therefore, the mother takes up the mantle of the world he has left after he has rejected the vocation of the priesthood as being outright worldly.

The conflict of breaking from the once avowed path to holiness is resolved “during a long walk”.³⁴ Stephen’s decision to refuse the call of a priest and to enroll to university should be underlined as another situational archetype of departure. As Van Ghent hypothesizes, Stephen *physically* breaks away from his father, but a break from his mother³⁵ happens and is especially transmitted through negation of this vocation, a vocation in the church (see 177).

The actual issue of the mother’s disapproval of Stephen’s secular choice reflects the fact that he has decided to find his own way which is also a negation of her. The actual revelation of Stephen against the church, as a body concerned with power and not the spirit, comes only after Stephen’s indulgence into that same world in which his ego-centralism drives him to be the best, the most holy, and not *Stephen*. While the mother, or society, or family would have found this ego conscious self of Stephen “fine”, they immediately and negatively disapprove of his choice

³⁴ Van Ghent insists on the fact that almost all resolution and propositions that Stephen has occur “during a walk”. If not a walk it is Stephen’s going into the water and waves. In *Ulysses* we will also find Bloom who wanders, Stephen who walks down the beach and has his interior monologue and it is almost like if they do not walk they will stop to think, to progress; everything that happens when they are not waking and when they are not alone are an obstacle. As reported by Ellmann, “Joyce liked taking preposterously long walks” (*JJ* 45). Beyond the apparent association of the journey, in which the character on a physical trip evolves throughout the movement of the character (the physical mirroring the mental), and besides the obvious fact that this is a novel in city before the advent of major public transportation systems where individuals *walked*, there is also an allusion to the peripatetic. The word, itself used to describe Aristotelian, is also used to describe the action of a teacher going from one place to another. There is no direct association, but Joyce’s insistence of the walk does mirror this odd concept. However, the actual importance is that of the metaphorical journey undertaken in which the mind is not in the same place it started.

³⁵ In *Stephen Hero* an important conversation takes place with Stephen and his mother concerned of his “disengagement” with the Church and religion: “I never thought I would see the day when a child of mine would lose the faith. God knows I didn’t. I did my best way for you to keep you in the right way. ... It’s all the fault of those books and the company you keep” (*SH* 135).

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

of study over the priesthood. According to the established arc, he has actually broken free of them, which creates the conflict, but if he were to create a sense of himself within the boundaries of the established egoism of the Church in he would be the most holy of holy, it would be ostensibly permissible, and a tragedy akin to the *Dubliners* type character who sees escape to abandon it. However, due to his newly found aesthetic sensibilities, these do not falter his decision, but provide a sense of guilt, reminding his pangs of conscious of what he has sacrificed to become *the artist*; namely, as association of lost heritage. These steps all can be encapsulated into rites of initiation which Stephen, as well as all hero-characters, passes through in order to advance from one set of reality to another; ultimately, emerging from the end as transformed and transforming the world around them.

Eliade terms this as a matter of the human condition in which initiation into the unknown realm also provides salvation after the fact, due to the transformation which has led to a conquering of mere reality. Initiation itself can be recognized by its pattern of the protagonist emerging from the struggle against antagonism, or as Eliade puts it, “in certain types of real ordeals that he undergoes-in the spiritual crises, the solitude and despair through which every human being must pass in order to attain to a responsible, genuine, and creative life” (*Rites and Symbols of Initiation* 128).

Stephen’s ordeals have culminated many times over before attaining a sense of who he wants to be and what life he wants to lead. The church and mother are the final extension since it is the ultimate antagonism of one against one’s natural origin (penultimate only to one against the self). Stephen here has been struggling, unbeknownst to his own mind while being enraptured in what he perceives as seeking the spiritual, as struggling against both these two. This path of sin and freeing himself from it, mistakenly with the church - or otherwise with politics, society, family - are the nightmare struggles Stephen has traversed which have tortured and elevated the essence of his being. The struggle gives rise into his imitation into a new character’s purview of the world. As Eliade also asserts, “man becomes *himself* only after having solved a series of desperately difficult and even dangerous situations; that is, after having undergone ‘tortures’ and ‘death’, followed by an awakening to another life, qualitatively different because regenerated” (*Rites and Symbols of Initiation* 128). However, the initiation is a piecemeal event, which happens in fits and starts. Therein, Stephen has epiphanies that separate him into the artist as graduation from one piece of a puzzle leading to the next. The revelation of the aesthetic to

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

harmonize Stephen with all aspects of his cognizance and background occurs when he has rejected “the priestly persona” (Kimball 51) after which he “moves on to another – the Persona of The Artist, which at the same time is hardly separable from his identity as a university student” (Kimball 51). Key here is the fact that he is still yet a student and has not overcome all potential traps, but he has emerged as his own self. The realization of the artist he desires to be, i.e. a life of aesthetics in which he can bring together both the educated and earthly spheres of his existence, come with “again, a vision – or rather a pair of visions – mark[ing] this solution” (Kimball 51). The final epiphany, as revelation comes to harmonize these two aspects of Stephen’s character, does not close the novel but rather assembles a purview of the character to which later challenges are set against.

4.3.5. The Final Epiphany of the Self – To Live and to Err as One

Despondent from what he had thought to clarify the meaning of his existence, soon after the interview with the director, Stephen again goes through the revelatory act of “walking” along the shore, feeling that the air is “timeless” (*P* 192), and all ages seem “as one to him” (*P* 192). The mark of this small reflection is not insignificant as it places the character into a setting in which the construct of the circumstances he is surrounded by takes second place to an eternal motif by which the protagonist can separate himself; i.e., divorced from his events that have been sundered, he can be left with the essence of who he is as represented by his thoughts. Eliade terms these moments as unique in escaping from the terror of history where the cycle of existence is constantly reestablished by the events unique to the individual’s existence, but shared in a common pattern of suffering within a historic nature: “[t]he only possibility of escaping from time, of breaking the iron circle of existences, is to abolish the human condition and win Nirvana” (*Cosmos and History* 116). Stephen has achieved a timeless sense here at this point in the novel by being subdued in all his aspirations and left without a clear objective in which his past and present merge as one. He has been placed into a situation at this moment where he is “simply contemplating the panorama of them terrifies man and forces him to realize that he must begin this same transitory existence and endure the same endless sufferings over again ... this results in intensifying his will to escape, that is in impelling him to transcend his

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

condition of ‘living being’, once and for all” (Eliade, *Cosmos and History* 116-17). For this reason, Joyce has the character again return to the contemplation of the origin of his name, its history and Stephen’s placement within its unique confines. When he realizes the significance of his name, the name of the fabulous artificer, “a hawk-like man flying sunward above the sea, a prophecy of the end he had been born to serve ... a symbol of the artist forging anew in his workshop out of the sluggish matter of the earth a new soaring impalpable imperishable being” (192). Stephen is both breaking free from the terror of history by seeing the unique nature of his suffering within the larger narrative of his life as well as recognizing the ebb and flow of all historical circumstance to which he is in an archetypal repetition, allowing him both to accept and free himself from the aspect of merely belonging to his historical circumstances. From this moment onward, he may set out on the path of being a person unto himself, not limited by his historical origin alone, but not free of it either.

This comparison prepares Stephen for his vision of the wading girl, where the imagery remains a sign of promise and of freedom. The most notable epiphany is exactly this one, “as well as the structural climax of the novel, the moment when Stephen becomes a conscious artist, when the rebel finds his cause” (Beja 100). Having decided instead to pursue a more secular education and future, as Stephen waits impatiently for his University entrance examination results, he sees a young girl wading at the beach and becomes fascinated by her girl’s gracefulness and innocence. It strikes him with the sudden realization that an appreciation for beauty can be truly good, without the need for its denial into shame or its glorification in spirituality. This moment is a classic example of Joyce’s belief that an epiphany can dramatically alter the human spirit in a matter of just a few seconds, i.e., the transitory nature of the moment carries into the eternal where “it may affect one’s entire life” (Beja 75). As he sits peacefully, contemplating this girl’s looks, Stephen realizes what the essence of beauty beneath the mere flesh of the woman. He perceives her inner beauty as well as her outer beauty, and finally, he understands the nature of aesthetics where “an object” can be seen in its many parts as opposed to an externally assigned meaning offered by the Church or other aspect of the Irish society of the novel. Indeed, his defense of this position is argued throughout the remains hundred or so pages of the novel where is challenged by political pressure, religious pressure, familial pressure, and peer pressure to change aspects of the personality he has forged in his epiphanies.

Of particular note in this epiphany is the counterpoised nature of how Stephen observes

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

her to the style of which Joyce portrayed the prostitutes and other sexualized *animae* for Stephen in the novel. While the carnality, even in immature description of semi-romantic form, is clear in his first sexual awakening, he accords no semi-divine characteristics to the prostitute as he is concerned only with losing himself in that of the other. Joyce uses the juxtaposition of “a huge doll sat with her legs apart in the copious easychair beside the bed” (P 114) to afford the prostitute an almost objectified nature where she is nothing but an object of use despite the childish romantic description. The seabird girl fits an entirely unworldly description, being accorded an otherworldly nature, whose beauty is not related to carnality, even though it encapsulates both a physical sexualized form and a beatific form. To wit, Joyce compares the girl to a “beautiful seabird” (P 195) and her face is “mortally beautiful” (P 195). Her silhouette appears slim and soft like a white feathered dove. The portrait of the girl is close to that of an angel. Here Joyce aims to flow the writing easily and uninterruptedly, making this passage seem more like a poem than a piece of prose. Although Joyce does not use lines and verses like he would in poetry, each part of the body described constitutes itself exactly like a stanza, and the repetitions “her bosom was as a bird’s soft and slight, slight and soft as the breast of some dark plumaged dove” (P 195) are like a leitmotif, meant to stress a particular characteristic.

At the end of the description, Joyce turns to a darker comparison of “a wild angel ... of mortal youth and beauty, an envoy from the fair courts of life, to throw open before him in an ecstasy the gates of all the ways of error and glory” (P 196). It is essential here to note again that she is an *anima* not *animus* event in the narrative. Unlike the other *animae* of the story to which Stephen is held against as being the example against which he should transform into, she denotes the nature of the opposite to which Stephen is struggling to come forth. Therein, although he names the woman an “angel”, she is a wild angel not of heaven but of nature, which ties together Stephen’s struggle between the two worlds: the spiritually aesthetic removed from the world (*the anima*) and the physical flesh of his historic suffering (*the animus*). “He felt above him the vast indifferent dome and the calm processes of the heavenly bodies; and the earth beneath him, the earth that had born him, had taken him to her breasts” (P 196). Yet, as these lines show, it is through this symbol that release is gained, as if it were divine intervention leading his astray into a new world. Aquinas wrote that “[N]ot everyone who is enlightened by an angel knows that he is enlightened by him” (*Summa*; pt. 1, q. 111, art. 1, ad. 3) but here it is clear that Stephen has tied the symbol of the seabird girl to his own freeing epiphany in both name and interpretation.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

According to Kimball, this vision “goes beyond the sexual to merge with the vision of his artistic vocation, and Stephen’s transfiguration here encompasses both life and art” (52). Beyond the common association where for instance in Christianity, the gnosis (word of god) and divine are two separate entities with the former being associated with the female and the latter with the male, the seabird girl is another archetypal form as such where gnosis is obtained through a moment of encountering beauty, specifically in the female form. Particularly here, the Great Goddess is Sophia (wisdom), whose “spiritual transformative character” (Neumann 216) not only “transcends the earth-night-unconscious aspect of the Feminine” (216), but “expresses ... the psychic situation of origination” (216).³⁶ In this regard, the girl herself may be interpreted as being strongly reminiscent of Dante’s Beatrice; she is the symbol freeing him to follow art and nothing else. The description of her flesh is also “softhued as ivory” (*P* 195) making her tantamount to Eileen and Emma before her, other tertiary characters of *anima* association where Stephen stumbles into epiphany as well. It logically stands then that Stephen’s reaction to the seabird girl is conveyed in such terms as “worship”, “Heavenly God” (*P* 195), “holly silence of his ecstasy” (*P* 196), “a wild angel” (*P* 196). Yet, despite all these phrases his emotion is far from religious and is in fact, like his joy - “profane”: “Heavenly God! cried Stephen’s soul, in an outburst of profane joy” (*P* 195). The final remarks here underscore that “[the] significance oscillates between the extremes of goddess and whore’, Stephen’s vision of the bird-girl calls him both to ‘error’ and to ‘glory’” (Kimball 52). Thereby he harmonizes two opposing forces from thesis and anti-thesis into synthesis. It then follows that the issuance of these words underscores the *animus/anima* relationship by which Stephen has been led to an epiphany through access to a divine gnosis, changing the profane nature of his existence into the profound.

Within the scope of epiphany developing character, Stephen here encounters fulfillment as the nature of the object in its true form (*teleiosis*) has been reached: he is now the artist whose character has been solidified, but not against the setting. Beja notes that “the artist has accomplished his full task only when an epiphany in art produces a revelation of nature, when

³⁶ Neumann puts forward the dual nature of the goddess as being a normal to its archetype, but maintains that “the spiritual transformative aspect of Sophia, which transcends the earth-night-unconscious aspect of Feminine – still the archaic self-contained form expresses the uroboric self – containment of the psychic situation of origination” (216), necessitating that the gnosis obtained through revelation and the divine which is gained are two parts of one whole. For Joyce, the nature of epiphany would then mean that the conclusion as well as the symbol is of the same. This is important to note that this follows the motif of mythology where touching the word or *gnosis* of the divinely inspired instils the same upon the character who does so.

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

fiction illumines reality, when literature becomes experience” (232). In this same manner, the nature of the epiphany as grandstanding marker of character development throughout the arc disintegrates as soon as it has accomplished its task and is no more throughout the text as it had been.

It is no mistake here that the majority of characters playing a role in Stephen’s epiphanical transformation have been feminine. It would seem that Joyce falls back on the archetype of the feminine, the woman, being a generative force, Campbell would concur, specifying that only through the woman in the narrative of mythology can such a change occur, as the *anima* concept of the woman as the archetype of mother gives birth to all life, as well as its transformation and combines both the spiritual nature of the mother as the issuer of life as well the originator of the suffering itself: “Man doesn’t enter life except by woman, and so it is woman who brings us into this world of pairs of opposites and suffering” (Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 65). Joyce has Stephen distance himself from even the mother archetype in the final section of the novel as he break free from archetypal association as the originator and life giver so that he may find his own life. By doing so, he establishes himself in his new found aesthete nature but at the cost of forcible alienation of his origins.

4.3.6. Escaping Temptations and Staying True to the Self

A unique problem within *A Portrait* is that the culmination of the character (coming to define who the character is) does not result in the end of the narrative, nor does it resolve the character arc. When Stephen realizes that he is not for the church, accepting the reality of himself as having his own identity outside those of the institutions he is presented against, he must also learn to define his own beliefs as they are challenged from without. Much like the proverbial temptations of Christ or the Buddha, once his enlightenment is obtained, it must be tested against the Earthly shackles from which he has escaped. To this end, the final third of the novel is dedicated, and in which Stephen, the amateur and naïve, albeit genially gifted and talented, aesthete is placed. Part discourse, part dialogue, part argumentation, part diary, the sections blend together to provide support for Stephen’s decisions as a character to “free” himself and why his revelation is true.

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

In spite of the novel itself ending, Stephen’s actual arc is never complete within it, save for the fact that he realizes his own nature. “Even at the end of the book, as Joyce pointed out to Frank Budgen, the artist is still a young man. He has a long way to go, before he can see himself ... clearly. ... The victory lay in abandoning of self-justification” (Bolt 91). Perhaps Stephen does not even come full circle as a character in *Ulysses*, but this need not matter as a final conclusion to the character as a whole is not the object of Joyce’s endeavor but to show how the artist emerged; i.e., the individuation of the self through their own archetypal experience.

Whatever the case may be, Stephen at the end of *A Portrait* has already found himself, but not his place within the world, and must test this identity against archetypal demons, tricksters, and others in a motif that serves to challenge and steel his character in its assurance. As a dialogue, it confronts norms of established Irish society, picking up the themes Joyce repeats throughout his works, and offers both intellectual and experiential arguments against them. However, these same dialogues may also be read as the protagonist’s defense against judgment when the original antagonism has been conquered. For Campbell, he deems such moments in narratives as when the hero has returned from encountering and conquering the original defying antagonism of the hero, such as when Siegfried conquers the dragon and must find his newfound powers against the court from which he has set out. Now the protagonist must test the new self which has been obtained against the world to which he has returned. Campbell also lays out this problem within *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*: “How teach again, however, what has been taught correctly and incorrectly learned a thousand thousand times, throughout the millenniums of mankind's prudent folly? That is the hero’s ultimate difficult task. How render back into light-world language the speech-defying pronouncements of the dark?” (202-4). Stephen is such a character, one who has gone through a spiritual journey who conquers internal monsters, not that of the adventurer who does so with external ones. Therefore, let it not be assumed that the symbolization utilized by Joyce has been set aside or that there is no such hint of revelation to the character, since this section of the work does not contain an epiphany of sorts as had been the essential backbone of the first two thirds of the narrative. This is simply not so. The scenes from this section of the narrative do not form Stephen’s identity unlike the ones before, but merely test it.

One of the better and more direct illustrations is the so-called “funnel” conversation (*P* 214) with the dean. It is generally cited as evidence that supports the claim that Stephen is an

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

artist appreciative of the language more so than the actual professor. Stephen, as Irishman is forced to be familiar as an outsider with a language alien to his own background in order to express himself artistically; the Englishman who is a purported expert is not as well-versed. Stephen may be stolid in the fact that he ultimately is as talented as he may perceive himself as the artist, comfortable in his sense of aesthetics, comparing the dean to be “[A] poor Englishman in Ireland” (P 214) and that “[H]is language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be acquired for me, a full speech” (P 215).

However, evaluating this intersection and episode of the narrative in such manner misses the point entirely. It underscores that although Stephen has had a revelatory experience which changes the view of his existence making him into the artist, testing it against his actual abilities within his existence has yet to be proven. Moreover, it subtly hints at the fact that Stephen, though assured in his aesthetic revelation, is unsure of himself as applied to the traditional boundaries against which his life is set.

The conversation itself revolves around Stephen’s concepts of aesthetic beauty, not only how he perceives them, but when he may write a paper about them, hinting at the fact that although enlightened Stephen may have issue applying himself. Joyce mirrors this in the dialogue with the dean proffering that there are “liberal arts and useful arts” (P 210) as he lights a fire. The dean noting that the lighting is a useful art while the aesthetics is a liberal one, Joyce here noting that while the two are twain from one another, they serve no purpose through this symbolization. It would seem that Joyce is implying that Stephen is yet unable to light a fire of his own as he is lost in his own knowledge, which follows the archetypal motif of obtaining a secret knowledge but not being able to control it or utilize it, thus being paralyzed or of no use in the process.

Joyce writes the dean in a positive and avuncular advising light. He has him mention the Greek stoic Epictetus, most noted for being an ancient philosopher who taught that philosophy must be applied as a way of existence and which Stephen has been struggling with. The dean mentions Epictetus’ lamp and that, to fill it much like making a fire, “[Y]ou must chose the pure oil and must be careful when you pour it in not to overflow it, not to pour in more than the funnel can hold” (P 214). While overshadowed by “tundish”, the dean is pointing to the issue of Stephen being unable to experience his own identity without the extremes of epiphany. Stephen’s own character has been written to only grow in starts and fit where there is absolute revelation,

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

not graduated. Stephen has been written to jump from one end to another. Now that he has reached a point in which this gigantism of the purely epiphanical has been forgone as his identity as the aesthetic artist is realized, he has no manner of realizing what this means in his life and his thought. This is a trap in which Stephen is seeking his own escape. Kimball concurs, stating that “[T]he picture of Stephen in the final chapter of *A Portrait*, which encapsulates his university experience, exhibits this kind of alternation, between contradictory feelings both equally real” (52). In this regard, the dean is a voice of external warning, not to imbibe too much of the ichor of the gods lest ye succumb to the blindness or madness it creates. Stephen has only been filled and drained at this point, not always by the best “oil” as well. In fact, he is in danger, much like the other characters of Joyce’s literary inventions, of acknowledging the truth while being powerless to do anything about it. He is in danger of being paralyzed or becoming the archetypal motif of the drowned man who is swallowed by an inundation of knowledge. His lamp must be lit at all times, not just in starts and fits.

Stephen is not blind or deaf to this fact as it is one of the three antagonisms of this section of the narrative (the others being not being led astray and cutting oneself off from the dependence of one’s perceived origins). The dean remarks that this sense of being unable to constantly apply the knowledge of aesthetics to one’s life is “like looking down from the cliffs of Mother into the depths. Many go down into the depths and never come up, only the trained diver can go down into those depths and explore them and come to the surface again” (*P* 212). This symbolization that Joyce uses places Stephen in the danger of succumbing to such depths as he has no training to dive into them and return, which shall be picked up in *Ulysses*, but for now it is one danger and temptation to either succumb to them and be drowned or not enter them. Stephen must find a way to do both that does not lead him astray.

If we were to apply Stephen’s own concept of aesthetics, this conversation on the same topic reveals Stephen to be the object of many differing internal parallels that must be merged together in order to achieve radiance, so that he may bother perceive the wholeness of his life with the harmony of his epiphany. Until this is done, all is at risk.

The danger in achieving the knowledge of epiphany is that it is particular to that which is revealed and may be just as easily misinterpreted. This has been the case earlier in the novel for the sin episode. The hero/protagonist must apply this knowledge against forms of temptation that lure the hero away from true recognition of the epiphany and false application of its knowledge,

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

again as had been almost the case for Stephen’s desire to become a priest.

After having established his artistic nature, he is even at greater jeopardy as it requires his eventual dissociation with his origins in order that it may be fulfilled. This may leave the protagonist in the position to recant the original revelation and apply it to a false idol or god, or to rejecting it, thereby incorporating it within the new epiphany of the self. These are severe temptations for the protagonist, let alone a young artist, as it is easier to ascribe the meaning of the epiphany to another aspect of life than to dive into it and try to come back up. In this same sense, Stephen is at danger of either never entering the waters of the epiphany itself as it could be blinded from elsewhere.

When Stephen is confronted by Davin, the latter confessing that he is an “Irish nationalist first and foremost” (P 229), it is direct challenge to Stephen, not necessarily to classify himself along the lines of pure nationalism, but to categorize himself on another’s terms of what he must be - an Irish nationalist or a Unionist. “You are a born sneerer, Stevie. One time I hear you talk against English literature. Now you talk against the Irish informers. Are you Irish at all?” (P 229) Yet assigning himself to either bears its own perils, as it automatically limits Stephen from pursuing his own goals found through the nature of his epiphany in the name of its subversion to a nationalist or social cause, for which it has no part. Stephen resists the temptation in part in the rebellious nature of the artist providing the answer: “When the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of nationality, language, religion. I shall try to fly by those nets” (P 231). This utterance reflects on the pitfalls that await one even after realizing the self – how to merge the new conception of reality with the bonds one has left as not to lose either.

Referring back to the conversation with the dean where he refers to looking down from the cliffs into “the Mother”, there is a double edged sword to Stephen as well. In order to explore the depths of the meaning that Stephen has found within himself, his hand will be forced to reject the origins of which he comes from in order to escape into as to learn from these same depths referred to as “Mother”. In one aspect, Stephen is deserting one Mother of his origins – his Irish heritage, the Irish Catholic Church, Irish society – to find the succor originating from the epiphany of his self as an artist. In this state, the shadow that had followed Stephen has been synthesized with the self. Therein, lies the problem, as, in *Man and His Symbols*, von Franz

*A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”*

comments that “[D]ivining in advance whether our dark partner symbolizes a shortcoming that we should overcome or a meaningful bit of life that we should accept this is one of the most difficult problems that we encounter on the way to individuation” (175-6). Stephen, although truly realizing the self by accepting the shadow, a fete of no small worth, still must individuate his own experience against the greater expanse of his surroundings, which does leave him dumfounded despite protestations.

Of corresponding interest to specifically note is that Joyce discludes the female *anima* as a signifier of change within the last chapter. Instead, Stephen breaks away from even Emma, “his beloved” (P 245), who has been replaced, as with all female forms in his life, with the aesthetic concept as his guiding voice, noted explicitly as: “[a]ll that I thought I thought and all that I felt I felt, all the rest before now, in fact... O, give it up, old chap! Sleep it off!” (P 288).

Although the ultimate end would be for him to incorporate the aspects of his heritage and origin into his newfound identity, forcing himself to reject these items leaves him with no recourse to. This challenge is not resolved in the novel, instead it is taken up as the rejection of the mother, in symbolic form by the rejection of the family and the mother as being the final associated tie to Irish society and the purely based persona that Stephen had created for his self, prior to his aesthetic self as born by the epiphany. The lack of ability to directly encounter and sublimate the knowledge attained is a form of drowning, which will come back to haunt him in the beginning of *Ulysses*. When Stephen merely associates nationality, language, religion as “nets” which can trap him, much like Gabriel in “The Dead”, he falls into the same predicament as Gabriel of not being able to purely acknowledge his origins. Unlike “The Dead” as well, Stephen has no resolution to this fact. Gabriel chose to travel, at least assumed metaphorically, to the Irish interior, while Stephen flies away in almost literal terms.

Theodore Spencer, in his introduction to *Stephen Hero*, asserts that in *A Portrait* “Stephen’s development as an individual ... sloughs the first four [themes]” (13). These four, including Stephen’s family, his social life, life of Dublin and Catholicism are undoubtedly reduced for the sake of the great theme – Art. However, in doing so, he is much like Icarus, who flies too close to the sun and loses his life in the glory of the blindness to what the sense of freedom brings him. Much like the dean, Daedalus warned his son not to fly too low or too high. It does not appear in the novel whether these words of warning are heeded to or not.

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

If this is the case, *A Portrait* is as much an epiphany to the reader of how to better unravel the tangled web of one's self-understanding hounded by one's existence, as it is a warning to not forsake all for the mania or frenzy of what has been attained by the epiphany. Stephen is not merely himself at the end of the novel. He has taken on a new persona which may be a mask which he wears: “As one engaged in a kind of religious quest, Stephen imagines spiritual fulfillment as coming through words, the poem he we see him write, the diary entries that end the book, and the way the young artist wields language as weapon and as a tool with which to seek enlightenment” (Van Ghent 168). There is no mention of the alienation he has ended in to his society at large, which was an apparent trouble for Joyce himself when he was alive.

Despite the fact that it might seem direct and instantaneous, the epiphany of art is only a finale of a study which determines boundaries of different styles and different genres. The three items confessed by Stephen leading to the understanding of an applied theory of aesthetics – *integritas* (wholness), *consonantia* (radiance) and *claritas* (clarity) – also conform to three disparate but essential bases that writers undertake in their endeavors: the creation of, destruction of, and application of what has been both created and destroyed to life itself. It is precisely this manner of artistic progression that will rule Joyce's universe.

When the diary excerpts overtake the narration, Kimball asserts that this “presents Stephen without his mask” (54). It reveals his uncertainty, insecurities, and thoughts that betray the character. Mainly, they show the refusal to accept conformity to any aspect that his thoughts may not adapt to or enclose easily. While this may be read as the triumph of the artist, it may also be read as an individual who, though individuating and internalizing themselves and their self, have not come to terms with the issues that still haunt them. Instead, we have a character who professes an ambitious manifesto in the closing lines of freedom in art for art's sake: “Welcome, O Life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated consistence of my race” (*P* 288). While this does mirror that Joyce is putting his character within the scope of falling into the archetypal role, a hero who will follow down another hero's journey of discovery and adventure, we also see him abandoning his homeland and his roots. Therein lies the rub. While it may seem odd to darken the conclusion as one of failure, this is not the point. Indeed, without the sequel – *Ulysses* – portraying the same Stephen as utterly lost after having gone on this journey, it would be read as only one of triumph. The fact of the matter is that Joyce has written it with foresight to be of

***A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN: CHARACTER PROGRESSION
THROUGH EPIPHANY – “AN ELEMENT IN ALL HUMAN EXPERIENCE”***

both.

It would be best to assume here that Stephen is not the mature all-knowing character, but one who has reached a self-knowledge barely obtained. The character himself still is lacking in complete closure. This may be evidenced by the lines “[O]ld father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead” (P 288). To the extent that the call to the artificer of his soul represents a latent rejection of the mother archetype as Stephen envisions it as the father, it does not actually represent a mark of total closure or maturity. Campbell deems this individual to be trapped, where “a negative mother-fixation, which entangles the person in a rather tawdry way and inadequate sort of family networks, so that he does not grow out of his infantile context. The mother then becomes a kind of threatening figure ...to compensate for that, one has an urge to find and become related to the great father image” (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 7). This denotes that the end has not yet come to the character only that this novel presents how the young man turned into the artist but not into the man. The archetypal haunting of the mother shall continue into *Ulysses*, necessitating that Stephen’s journey, which has begun in his homeland, can only end there as well. However, without departing from Ireland, Stephen may not be able to return and harmonize both his actual and artistic self. The novel leads only to this point of the character arc and hero’s journey.

5. A Luminous Darkness: Archtexts and Archetypes in *Ulysses*

5.1. *Making the Everyday Odyssey*

Longest way round is the shortest way home.
– James Joyce, *Ulysses*

Ulysses, the very name itself forces one to dwell on literature – whether the reader is familiar or not with Homer’s epics of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or James Joyce’s literary monolith of the same name and theme from 1922. From Odysseus’ *Odyssey* until that of Stephen Dedalus, as well as both Leopold and Molly Bloom, one may see how literature becomes interwoven into an expanding quilt of similar motifs, patterns, and archetypes. Joyce’s deliberately chosen title of *Ulysses* is a reflection of its three thousand year old epic origins of prehistoric period of ancient Greece, itself a manifestation of the *hero’s journey* and its *monomyth*, which can be pulled out at any period to assign itself to the times of its new creation. Here its broadest essence is examined by its form penned in 1922, allowing one to still see how loudly archetypes echo across the course of human existence.

Joseph Campbell was of the opinion that Homer’s *Odyssey* was an epic of many differing, separate, but corresponding themes that come together as a journey of self-quests:

You’ll see three journeys. One is that of Telemachus, the son, going in quest of his father. The second is that of the father, Odysseus, becoming reconciled and related to the female principle in the sense of male-female relationship, rather than the male mastery of the female that was at the center of the *Iliad*. And the third is of Penelope herself, whose journey is ... endurance”. (*Pathways to Bliss* 145)

Conversely, in *Ulysses* three journeys are also undertaken: Stephen Dedalus in search of his own identity as an artist in backdrop of an absent father figure to guide him; Leopold Bloom who has lost his son and is estranged from both reality and his wife stemming from his own insecurity; and Molly Bloom who reflects upon her life as torn between her desires and her

loyalty, trying to reconcile the existence she has come to. Though separate as characters, “their deeds correspond to an intertextual framework of myths and archetypes that guides their lives by means of analogy and correspondence” (Fuchs 21). Their personal traits aside, these three main characters, as Tindall argues, “compose a trinity” (*Guide to James Joyce* 124), stating that they are “more than individuals, they represent man and two of his aspects” (124). It may be readily concluded then that Stephen Dedalus represents intellectuality, Mrs. Marion Molly Bloom carnal desires or the “flesh”, while Mr. Bloom is Joyce’s *Everyman* between the two extremes (see Tindall, *Guide to James Joyce* 124). Therein, the action in the novel as a congruent whole is not only archetypal, but “one of the oldest and most familiar stories in the world” (Tindall, *Guide to James Joyce* 124).

If only one interpretative context is to be chosen, archetypal criticism must be supplemented at this point by intertextuality as being inherent to the criticism itself due to the multiple manifestation and reflection of the archetype in a shared corpus of literature. In this manner, the same interpretative context may be more easily reduced to finding meaning in the context of shared texts or fragments thereof, visible or less visible allusions, parody and citations. Since there is a multitude of known archetypal structures that are intertextual in nature to other major literary works as well as cultural references when reading Joyce’s *Ulysses*, the interpretation of the novel, the observation and analysis of it, relies on its corresponding characteristic passages/fragments found in other literary works.

Joyce “adapts” Homer’s *Odyssey* to the modern reader by placing it in a lethargic Dublin everyday life in the early twentieth century, but this does not mean it has been disassociated from a correspondence to the same archetypal plot. As Fuchs notes in his essay in *Joyce/Shakespeare*, this “representation of everyday life is blended with ... Homer’s *Odyssey* to compensate for the ... experience of loss of sense and continuity with archetypal patterns of order and meaning” (21). Fascinated by the multiplicity of Odysseus’ character in his journey homeward, Joyce used this as a template through which the characters of *Ulysses* must find their way homeward as well, being lured and sidetracked by the same obstacles and challenged by the same antagonisms. Accordingly, Joyce also based other intertextual allusions³⁷, such as with *Hamlet*, into the journey home structure as well.

³⁷ While examining the Shakespearean *Ulysses* from *Troilus and Cressida*, the Odyssean Shakespeare of *Hamlet* and the *Sonnets*, Joyce’s presentation of Shakespeare’s Last Will as an “Odyssean” document, and Sir Philip

Joyce wanted a character ideal in his or her multifaceted structure and complexity to allude to in the creation of his own epitome of the everyman. In his influential biography on James Joyce, Ellmann notes that Joyce had once spoken to the literary critic Frank Budgen on the selection of a preferable modeled character. Selecting from the rich expanse offered within western literature, Joyce came to the conclusion that only Ulysses (read: Odysseus) would do, due to the fact that he was no simple character, but one with many aspects to explore:

He [Joyce] was writing a book based on the *Odyssey*, but dealing with eighteen hours in the life of a contemporary man. He was at pains to point out ... the many-sided nature of his hero. ‘You seem to have read a lot, Mr. Budgen’, he said. ‘Do you know of any complete all-round character presented by any writer?’ (Ellmann, *JJ* 435)

After having nominated Christ, Faust, and Hamlet, all of whom Joyce disregards, providing his own reasoning, Budgen eventually nominated Ulysses:

‘Your complete man in literature is, I suppose, Ulysses?’ ‘Yes’, said Joyce. ‘Ulysses is son to Laertes, but he is a father to Telemachus, husband to Penelope, lover of Calypso, companion in arms of the Greek warriors around Troy, and King of Ithaca. He was subjected to many trials, but with wisdom and courage came through them all’. (Ellmann, *JJ* 435)

Moreover, it would appear, at least according to Ellmann, that Joyce selected Odysseus to allude to as he saw the character as one that could be examined in a multifaceted manner, complete in

Sydney’s Ulysses-like *Astrophil and Stella*, Dieter Fuchs warns the reader of Joyce’s “art of the gap” and “ironic indirection” (24), which has already here been noted for this dissertation’s analysis of *Dubliners*. Fuchs specifically points out how “the name of the Homeric Odysseys only appears in the unexplained title of *Ulysses*, but not in the body of the text, which refers only to non-Odyssean Ulysses figures – such as Ulysses Brown ... and Ulysses Grant ... – rather than to the Homeric archetype” (24). Therein, much like in *Dubliners*, by acknowledging the existence of *gnomon* in Joyce’s texts, the critic/reader is able to comprehend more fully through these silences and gaps. Whilst the research at this point is exclusively concerned with “the ancient source text of Homer’s *Odyssey*” (24) as an archtext, it is necessary to point out how the Odyssean *gnomon* can be expanded into “Joyce’s allusions to post-Homeric rewritings of the Odysseus theme” (24). Undoubtedly, the most prominent of these stand out as the *Divine Comedy*, *Troilus and Cressida* and Tennyson’s “Ulysses”. For a closer and more insightful analysis see Fuchs, pp. 21-37.

his own nature but one still able to be sculpted from scratch: “I see him from all sides, and therefore he is all-round in the sense of your sculptor’s figure. But he is a complete man as well – a good man” (qtd. in Ellmann, *JJ* 435-6).³⁸ This quote also touches upon the concept that Joyce was selecting a character to facilitate incorporated ideals that were beyond modern fetishisms of war and who focused on the hero being a “good man” instead of one praised only for glory.

It is therein quite clear by the writer’s own admission and intention that he wanted to emulate the very nature, at least in form and character, of Ulysses. This is not to say that he wanted to copy it verbatim. Rather, Joyce wanted to write a modern *Odyssey*. Structurally, the novel does not have twenty four chapters like Homer’s epic, but the eighteen chapters that mostly do correspond on the associative, symbolic and somewhat ironic way Joyce sought to achieve their counterparts – not all of them major sections of the epic.

The deconstruction of Homer’s epic already looms in the title; Ulysses is the Latin name for Odysseus. The basic pattern of action is related to the model of the *Odyssey*: a son’s search for his father, a hero’s search home, both searching for one another, both left wandering, both return home, one to his wife, one to his “mother”. The most superficial comparison with the famous *ur-text* shows that Joyce actually wrote a modern *Odyssey* as homage to the great epic. Joyce’s Ulysses – Leopold Bloom, is in every respect the anti-hero, his Penelope – Molly Bloom is the exact opposite of Odysseus’, and the experiences and scenes through which they pass are nothing but a parody of heroic events of the *Odyssey*, in order for the text of the everyman to come alive. Only Stephen as Telemachus has certain qualities, such as learning and ideal aspirations, to guide him on a “hero’s quest”, but in reality he is a misguided person, and it is revealed that Bloom is the one who brings him full circle and who had been searching for a decade to reconcile himself with his life and escape his “eating of lotuses”.

Joyce’s parody was crafted to embody a contrasting role to literature of the early twentieth century. For 1922, it could be considered to be both of its time and ahead of its time due to its intended emulation, reviving literary history by absorbing its evolution and repeated examination of common themes as being eternal and opposed to the modern concept of the narrative existing as inherent to its time, place, and philosophy. In his authentic and peculiar literary work, Joyce builds parts in the form of quotes through allusion, parody and comparisons

³⁸ Also in Letter to Frank Budgen, July 11, 1919, *Selected Letters*, p. 239; see also Mary Colum, *Life and the Dream*, pp. 383-4, or unpublished letter to Ezra Pound from April 1, 1918.

from previous literature; as a result, he defends them from oblivion providing a multitude of corresponding interpretations that reverberate throughout English literary history. Thus, besides the obvious Homeric parallels, *Ulysses* is in its entirety intertextual and archetypal as it is reflected in the basic foundations of the work itself.

However, there is a limit to which the analysis of *Ulysses* can be made based purely on analyzing it through the *Odyssey*. It stands more as a skeleton to the story, sharing in similar plot points, but not whatsoever attempting to become the *Odyssey*. Joyce is crafting his own beast. According to Ellmann, “Joyce felt at liberty to deal with Homer as highhandedly as Virgil had done, keeping the basic typology but varying and omitting and adding, as his own book required” (*Four Dubliners* 72). Therein, Homeric parallels should not be something on which one should strictly analyze Joyce’s novel, but rather a mythical base from which Joyce recreate myth out of myth. Paunović notes in his afterword to his translation of *Ulysses* that “the impact and importance of the *Odyssey* are overrated even when it comes to the structure of Joyce’s work”³⁹ (775). He fervently disagrees that it should be the only point from which the novel is to be examined, especially in an intertextual context, due to the fact that “[A]ccording to the author’s initial idea of this novel, parallels with Homer’s *Odyssey* was supposed to play a more important role”⁴⁰ (776). Paunović gives Joyce’s reason that “is not good to create quite sturdy and precise plan in advance”⁴¹ (776) especially on the occasion of writing or reading the text.

Therefore, this doctorate does not seek to compare on an equal basis the *ur-text* phenomenon, but draw from it the archetypal presence which it pertains to, since any work is of its own as well as shared within a layered phenomenon of cross literary and psychological manifestation.

³⁹ „Uticaj i značaj *Odiseje* precenjeni su i kada je reč o strukturi Džojsovog dela“ (trans. author).

⁴⁰ „... prema piščevoj početnoj ideji o ovom romanu, paralela sa Homerovom *Odisejom* trebalo je da odigra mnogo značajniju ulogu“ (trans. author).

⁴¹ „... nije dobro unapred stvarati sasvim čvrst i precizan plan“ (trans. author).

5.2. Transforming the Historic into the Eternity – the Monomythic Experience of Hero's Journey

Every life is many days, day after day. We walk through ourselves, meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love, but always meeting ourselves.
– James Joyce, *Ulysses*

There are two distinct natures of the text which can be pinpointed in Joyce's works as they develop over the course of his life. The first which Joyce dedicates himself to may be termed as the historicity of a work (text)⁴². This aspect particularly incorporates the actual event, where the actions themselves have value in their distinct development as they occur and build upon one another and are speciated unto themselves. The eternal, which Joyce delved into more as he matured as an author, is opposite to the historic. Instead of focusing on the events unfolding, the eternal focuses on the event being second to the eternal, where it merely is a reflection of a story that is told repeatedly and which all new stories merely refer to in their understanding. Therein, while every story may be special, it may not be its own as it is but the same story retold.

While archetypes have been utilized hereto as being the key to understanding Joyce and while they pertain to the eternal aspect, their symbolic usage has been thus far relied on in a coherent reading of the text and have not related to a pure archetypal form; i.e., it has been thus examined how Joyce forged a unique character of Stephen in *A Portrait* through the use of archetype merely as a reference point to the establishment of Stephen's history. *Ulysses*, however, clearly departs from this pattern in order to focus more on the eternal and less on the historic aspect. For this very distinct reason, *Ulysses* displays many features unto itself differing from *A Portrait*. The most diverse is that of Joyce's "usylessly unreadable Blue Book of Eccles" (*Finnegans Wake* 179.26-27) takes on an archetypal aspect in which style, substance, and reference pertain more to the eternal constant aspect of the archetype and less to the historic. This concept grows throughout the development of the novel itself, where the character of

⁴² Louis Montrose in *Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture* claims that "the historicity of texts" refers to the "cultural specificity and social embedment of all modes of writing" (240-247); i.e., the foundation of a text in the social-historical, political and cultural setting of its production. This same concept therefore bears heavily on the focus of the progression and development from one's origins as opposed to the eternal concepts which are universal and which are shared in total by all (as would be found within the collective unconscious, as one example).

Stephen eventually comes to be replaced or developed by the eternal concepts of Leopold and Molly Bloom.

Yet the novel begins in a historic mood, essentially taking off where *A Portrait* ended. Stephen has developed into a character imbued with a modicum of knowledge, allowing him to view the world as a diverse conglomeration of many disparate parts. This aesthetic view has separated him from his worldly surroundings, whereby he had taken flight away on “the wings of art” to pursue this secret knowledge to its end and make himself whole within it. However, *Ulysses* starts with his abject failure at doing so, having returned to Ireland and mirroring the end of *A Portrait* in which he was unable to apply or harmonize this same knowledge with his historic existence. The issue is that Stephen has tapped into the eternal, but has been unable to translate it into the historic nature of his life. The secret knowledge is always, by definition, an eternal aspect of understanding which merely receives interpretation to the actual and historic nature as it is lived. For Campbell, he deems it as “some life-giving elixir” (*The Power of Myth* 157), expounding, in that regard how important it is to recognize the mystery of the eternal to reflect on the actual experience of life: “It’s important to live life with the experience, and therefore the knowledge, of its mystery and of your own mystery. This gives life a new radiance, a new harmony, a new splendor” (Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 207). In other terms, it may be said that it is equally important to find the archetypal within the actual, for the former to help make sense of the latter. Without an understanding of the eternal, however, one risks being consumed by it.

Therein, the consequence of Stephen’s ability to emerge as an artist, without the actual application, is inherent to the *monomyth* of the *hero’s journey*, where the hero first is illuminated by this knowledge, but must undergo a further process to understand and use it as it changes the world around the hero, not just the hero proper. Campbell notes that Stephen’s problem is standard, as “[T]he first problem of the returning hero is to accept as real, after an experience of the soul-satisfying vision of fulfillment, the passing joys and sorrows, banalities and noisy obscenities of life” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 202). The observance on the beach of a trawler looking for a body that had recently drowned, as in the “Proteus” chapter, is the echo of Stephen’s fears, not obviously of dying or drowning, but of being consumed by the nature he has reached in his character at that time. Notwithstanding the emergence to the artist made within *A Portrait*, Stephen has been left adrift even after having flown away on the wings of art. His

disassociation with reality as to find his true self, i.e. the sacrifice made in order to accomplish the task and which Cranly had warned of (“Alone, quite alone. You have no fear of that. And you know what that word means? Not only to be separate from all others but to have not even one friend” [*P* 281-2].) now needs to be atoned for by finding his actual place in the world given the cognizance that he possesses and which sets him apart through a return.

The drowned man itself is an archetype found in literature where the water which should otherwise cleanse and renew one’s life swallows it whole. Much akin to the monk archetype who is lost in an ivory tower of his or her own making (as the tower Stephen finds himself in at the beginning), the drowned man has touched revelation and the epiphany has consumed him. As opposed to *Dubliners* where epiphany is not gained and the characters unaffected, the knowledge gained from an epiphany can also leave the character as powerless as that before if one does not know how to apply it to reality. Here, this unique reflective nature Joyce assigns Stephen as he observes others on the beach contemplating himself and thinks: “A drowning man. His human eyes scream to me out of horror of his death. I... With him together down... I could not save her. Waters: bitter death: lost” (*U* 42).

By becoming the aesthete, Stephen’s character is no longer his own but a mere instance in the eternal, sacred repetition of the myth or narrative itself. However, he does not know so and becomes lost. As referenced in the prior chapter of this dissertation, he is in danger of “drowning” within the knowledge obtained. Moreover, his new-found “freedom” has not produced the effect he had desired, his return to Ireland also marred by his impotence at writing. In the “Proteus” chapter, among other things in his life, Stephen is lead to recall “[R]eading two pages apiece of seven books every night” (*U* 37) and reprimanding himself (in the second person): “[B]ooks you were going to write” (*U* 37). This sentiment is counter-posed to the “Telemachus” chapter in which Haines, an Englishman, is writing a book which Stephen cannot even make an endeavor to do so. By default, either robbing or corrupting Stephen of the talent itself.

The drowned man archetype directly correlates with the deluge motif. Despite the fragile nature of the self, it is necessary for it to “periodically be engulfed, because it is the fate of all forms to be dissolved in order to reappear. If ‘forms’ are not regenerated by being periodically dissolved in water, they will crumble, exhaust their powers of creativity and finally die away” (Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* 211). The danger facing Stephen and all those who

have been enlightened by the contact with knowledge leading to the true self nature is that it may overtake them and the deluge shall not stop.

Since the knowledge is eternal, harmonization of it with the banality of life is also aiming for the eternal. Therefore, the one-day revelation which Stephen shall go through with Leopold Bloom as a mentor *qua* an archetype of wise old man serves to transform the historic into the eternal. Stephen gives up his role within this novel to Leopold as the latter represents the everyman concept where the individual is able to remove themselves from their own historicity and escape into the true meaning of eternity (in Jungian terms, the collective unconscious). Therefore, *Ulysses* is a more representative form of the archetype as used in the monomythic structure since it appeals to the archetypal singularity of the hero's journey while partially abandoning the circumstance of the character as supplied by their history.

Despite the fact that the story originates as a work of the author's vision and is unique to itself in this regard, it would seem that the limitations in storytelling require that the author conform to certain bases of the narrative for the story itself to be understood. The structure itself is based on the forms of archetypal structures that all lend themselves to the creation of the narrative's form, which are equally used in its criticism. Discussing mythological and archetypal approaches in *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*, Wilfred Guerin et al. point to Sir James G. Frazer's monumental work – *The Golden Bough*, which “has exerted an enormous influence on twentieth-century literature, not merely on the critics but also on such creative writers as James Joyce, Thomas Mann, and T.S. Eliot” (192). What Frazer's main contribution added to literature “was to demonstrate the ‘essential similarities of man's chief wants everywhere and at all times’” (Guerin et al. 192). Thereby, Frazer aimed to demonstrate an equal origin to the mythologies that arose in humanity as a consequence of universality. Authors who took up a modernist standpoint of this argumentation sought to incorporate the mythological constructs of the shared literary world into their works in order to consciously create works that would more readily and directly resonate in their reading with the reader. In Jungian terms, these structures lie within the realm of the archetypes of the collective unconscious, in the same manner that the mind is unique to the individual but the same to all of humanity, where the archetype is universal and the artistic work brings it to fruition. Consequently, “the so-called archetypes or archetypal patterns that the writer has drawn forward along the tensed structural wires of his or her masterpiece and that vibrate in such a way that a sympathetic resonance is set

off deep within the reader” (Guerin et al. 183) is a promise of constant relationship of the reader to the work that is or is to become a “classic”, which is utilized by modernist writers, not least of whom is Joyce who, in *Ulysses*, creates an active construct that incorporates many archetypal patterns into one not only for their exploration, but also for their utilization as telling the timeless story again. Joyce was aware of this in his writing, but in his desire to design a great literary work, he may have also unwittingly made his works more accessible in spite of their proclaimed difficulty.

This concept of a universal story, lying outside the realm of pure structuralism as found with Propp, was first outright proposed in Joseph Campbell’s seminal work *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949). He suggested and theorized heavily on the concept of a *monomyth* which is “[T]he standard path of the mythological adventure of the hero ... a magnification of the formula represented in the rites of passage: separation—initiation—return” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 28). This concept “which might be named the nuclear unit of the monomyth” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 28) points to the fact that all mythologies must share and take part within a monomythic structure, which need not be the same in all forms or incorporate every aspect, but which must be returned to in order for the story itself unfold. In simpler terms, one could say that humanity as a species, which Jung would agree with, has been telling themselves the same story over and over again throughout the paradigm shifts and zeitgeist of their brief existence as a species. The essence of such a singular mold to myth or fiction is that the narrative must follow a series of signs posted along the road of the journey of the hero (protagonist) which fits an archetypal narrative structure by which the story advances and unfolds, without which the progression of the story does not occur, nor can do so. As noted, all signs need not be present, but a plurality may be easily found in an analysis of mythology, especially any random epic selected wherein the hero experiences the formula of the monomyth. Beyond this fact, the monomyth, from the evolution of the epic to the modern novel, has also been transmigrated, but not inherently changed. For this reason, the voyages of Odysseus, Hamlet, or Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus all contain the same overarching structure even when they are unique to their own creation. This is to say the historicity of their existence of coming into being exists separately, but not the narrative itself which merely adapts to the monomyth and the archetype.

More to the point, the hero (or protagonist's) character arc is unified into a singular structure, which Joseph Campbell proposed within the "monomyth" configuration. The hero must venture forth to overcome the antagonism by going through a process of separation-initiation-return according to which the hero adventures outward as much as inward into the self, changing not only the hero, but the world itself:

[A] hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man. (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 28)

Tested against the journey of Osiris, Prometheus, Buddha, Moses, and Jesus Christ, this monomythic structure is a symbolically rendered process of self-realization in which meaning emerges from the collective unconscious of mankind through powerful archetypes among which the most prominent are the threatening female manifested in *the anima* (if the character is an animus), *the mother*, *the shadow*, *the wise old man*, and *the trickster*. There are in this journey multiple phases: the call to adventure, the road of trials, the numinous realization – all processes which may be summarized for the purposes of this dissertation as falling into three universal categories: (1) departure, (2) the trials of initiation, and (3) the return.

Therefore, the narrative archetype employed by Joyce in the form of *the hero's journey*, as Campbell defines it, is not simply the understanding of myth or how a narrative may function universally, but a proposition on the form by which all narratives rest. Subsequently, it is also suggested that all stories must follow the same form. Much like Propp, who first suggested that all folktales must have a sequence of threes⁴³, Campbell's monomyth notes that all myths must take and complete the same steps in order to be actualized. It is therefore important to note that the theory of a *monomyth* is not one by which literature is merely understood, but one by which the inherent concept of the story writ large is allowed to be written or told. The steps in the hero's journey must take place in order that there be a story at all; they underlie not just plot, but

⁴³ For numerous examples see Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*.

character and conflict as well. These are so inherent to any given tale that the essential concept of a story may not exist without them.

Furthermore, being a student of Jung, Campbell also applied Jung's theory of archetypes to the *monomyth* by which the steps of the hero are reflected themselves back into one archetypal type (such as *the wise old man*, in this particular novel – Bloom, who assists the hero, in whatever form help is offered and given). However, as applied to “myth” in a literary understanding of the reading of a text, the individualization of the reader as he or she reflects upon the monomyth of the story, contributes to the reader's own individualization of its archetypes as to his or her unique individual understanding of the myth as the reader ponders upon it. Hence, the reader takes the hero's journey upon him or herself as based on their own experience as well, equating the structure of the narrative as defined by the archetypal experience of the hero's journey into his or her own experience(s).

To conclude this brief background on theory, it must be mentioned that Campbell was not the coiner of the word “monomyth”. This honor belongs to James Joyce himself who mentions it (though only once) in his final work – *Finnegans Wake*:

Ah, dearo! Dearo, dear! And her illian! And his willyum! When they were all there now, matinmarked for lookin on. At the carryfour with awlus plawshus, their happy ass cloudious! And then and too the trivials! And their bivouac! And his *monomyth*! Ah ho! Say no more about it! I'm sorry! I saw. I'm sorry! I'm sorry to say I saw! (FW 581, emphasis added)

Joyce, in *Finnegans Wake*, delves completely into the prehistoric concept of the story as base archetype to write repeatedly on the same subjects and themes as they appear in a circular form. In Jungian terms, as Campbell notes, it may be read to manifest “that the mysterious energy for inspirations, revelations, and actions in heroic stories worldwide is also universally found in human beings” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* xxv). Thus then is the monomyth.

According to these aspects, it is valuable to examine Joyce. Not only due to the fact that he wrote *Ulysses* to incorporate multiple examples of myth and literary works in the text itself, but also that examining it from this standpoint of an overarching skeleton of such used archetypes that is inherent to all narratives allows for the insight into the text as well. Therefore,

it is the aim of this chapter to track Stephen Dedalus as a hero of his own inner journey in which external events have a deeply felt inward resonance which is symbolically rendered through archetypes drawn from Homer, the Jewish and Catholic traditions, Shakespeare, among other sources. It is hoped that a close reading of *Ulysses* employing Jung's archetype as employed by Joseph Campbell's monomyth as an investigative tool or methodology will not only bring out an important theme in the text, but also underline the deeper narrative structure in the stream of consciousness usage of Joyce.

It is not easy to make sense of the apparent epic nature of a single mundane day. However, if the author's objective are better examined through the prism of reflection, fantasy, hallucination and dreams in which our most intimate experiences are enriched by the ageless and universal archetypes and rituals, these same instances are transformed into a structuring device in a work that covers a great deal of ground in a short day. From this distinct viewpoint of analysis, this day, later to be celebrated as Bloomsday, does not simply start with Bloom getting up, but with him representing Homer's *ur-text* as Odysseus arises beside his Penelope – the remarkable Molly Bloom, has a breakfast of kidney fried to perfection, being a great fan of the inner organ of animals, serving to illustrate Bloom as the character of the carnal as well. He ventures forth from 7 Eccles Street, leaving his great love amiably to her suitor, "Blazes" Boylan. Our very strange Odysseus encounters his "son", his Telemachus, finds an escape from his personal anguish and a kind of wholeness and fulfillment as he tenderly kisses his wife behind entering his bed at last, leaving the last wonderful and oft-cited lines to his "anima", his female nature now fully set loose in dreams.

It is true that Carl Jung himself expressed in 1932 essay bewilderment at *Ulysses*, for apparently Bloomsday meant for "the inventor of archetype" as an analytic instrument,

a book which pours along for seven hundred and thirty-five pages, a stream of time of seven hundred and thirty-five days which all consist in one single and senseless every day of Everyman, the completely irrelevant 16th day of June, 1904, in Dublin – a day on which, in all truth, nothing happens. (116; vol. 15)

That *Ulysses* "pours along", that it is about the "irrelevant" and "senseless every day of Everyman", where "nothing happens" is all too often the experience of the book's readers, and

precisely the view this investigation looking into the symbols of the mental process contents. Ironically by applying Jung's own terms to uncover the inward experience and its symbolic representations of the modernist classic which serves as a scaffolding and structuring device. That leads at last to a wonderful journey full of those very archetypes that Jung first proposed as arising from the collective unconscious of mankind.

In fact, the scientific veracity of Jung's psychology is not at issue, nor the personal relationship between Jung and Joyce.⁴⁴ The pioneering work in this area was done by Jean Kimball, as has already been established hereto in the dissertation, in *Odyssey of the Psyche: Jungian Patterns in Joyce's Ulysses*. She is particularly interested in the relationship between Joyce and Jung arguing that the person of the author and his struggles with the Catholic Church through Jungian archetypes lies at the basis of the psychological content of Stephen's self-development and integration. This investigation pays little attention to Joyce's own person as the writer in order to focus most closely on how archetypes work in the text regardless of Jung's formulations. Far closer to this inquiry is aforementioned Joseph Campbell's *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words: On the art of James Joyce*, walking the reader through *Ulysses* as if he were telling the story and employing Jungian psychology for its inner meaning in Stephen's character development and psychological healing.

Closer to this line of investigation is T.S. Eliot's proposal, a first for reviews in the year the celebrated *Waste Land* appeared in 1923 in "Ulysses, Order and Myth" of a structuring device derived from "[P]sychology ... ethnology and *The Golden Bough*" (269), which, by its design, works by "manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity"

⁴⁴ It is important to highlight the fact that even though this dissertation relies on Jungian (archetypal) criticism, Joyce was not one for psychoanalysis nor for Jung, which may seem to be a counter or weak point to the entire argument. However, since one need not agree with an established in order to examine a text which was written external to it, there is not much of objection that should be raised. Moreover, despite a certain "animosity" between Jung and Joyce, they did know of one another and admired one another in their own manner. Their relationship as two great minds was fraught and had a quite odd history of reconciliation and rejection, which neither credits nor discredits this dissertation's aims. However, let it suffice to note that "[A]ny ill feeling Joyce may have harbored toward Jung in consequence of this affair must have dissipated somewhat when, in 1932, Jung published "*Ulysses: A Monologue*", a psychological analysis of the work. Jung praises the novel and comments upon its difficulty but misunderstands the novel's artistic achievements, such as the linguistic brilliance of the narrative. In an August 1932 letter to Joyce, Jung acknowledged having "learned a great deal from [Ulysses]". Nonetheless in several places in *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce satirizes Jung (see, for example, *FW* 115.20–24; 268.R3; and 307.3–4). Despite his antipathy for analysis and with the encouragement of Maria Jolas, two years later Joyce, in desperation over the growing mental illness of his daughter, Lucia, agreed to allow Jung to analyze her. The results, however, proved less than satisfactory, and in January 1935 Joyce discontinued Lucia's analysis and terminated all further contact with Jung" (Fagnoli and Gillespie 304). For more on their relationship, see Bowker, Gordon. *James Joyce: A New Biography* (2012), especially the "Death, Birth, and Madness" chapter.

(269), that is “a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the universal panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history” (270). This is the “nightmare” from which Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom seek to awake from an inward journey rich in meaning beneath the outward unfolding actual events of the story. Therein, Stephen’s journey is divided into three sections following Joseph Campbell’s lead involving a heroic journey to self-discovery.

The rich intertextuality of *Ulysses* draws *Hamlet* and the *Odyssey* into its symbolic framework as well as a host of other traditions serving as a structuring device and access to an overtly complex work which yet relates a story of self-integration by the means of the devices which are employed to provide a close reading of the text where quest, conflict, resolution, and transformation will take place through an inward process symbolically represented by an encounter repressed and buried instincts, desires, emotions, secrets and unacknowledged needs. These conglomerate to be the dark side of the self, “the shadow” which is “that hidden, repressed, for the most part inferior and guilt-laden personality ... and so comprise the whole historical aspect of the unconscious” (266; Jung, vol. 9, pt. 2). What makes recognizing the shadow so very difficult is that it contains the repressed and disavowed parts of our own selves in which basic Jungian archetypes are set in dynamic motion. The conscious self does not want to acknowledge the unconscious motivation despite the pull it has on the total self. Nonetheless, in spite of the negative implications that the shadow may seemingly portend, this is not the case, as it is merely the underlying construct of the unconscious to the self. “The shadow, does not consist only of morally reprehensible tendencies, but also displays a number of good qualities, such as normal instincts, appropriate reactions, realistic insights, creative impulses, etc.” (Jung 266; vol. 9, pt. 2). Bearing this definition of the archetype in mind, the shadow emerging to be recognized in the light of the self is the conflict of the individual portrayed in *Ulysses*.

The “Departure” section studies the first two chapters of *Ulysses* “Telemachus”, “Nestor”, commonly called along with “Proteus”, “The Telemachiad”, as the separation of the hero from the old world and its compromised system of beliefs and rituals leading, in the process, to the feeling of inner alienation and the yearning for wholeness and connectedness. The journey itself initiates in the “Proteus” chapter of *Ulysses* and the psychological crisis that a loss of meaning and alienation from home may entail. Finally, the epic “Nostos” or return home is read most closely employing the “Ithaca” chapter as a way of reintegration of the self with others

and with oneself. After examining Stephen through the archetypal construct of the monomythic *hero's journey*, the main focus starts to be slowly transferred to Leopold Bloom in the “Hades” chapter, concluding with the “Penelope” chapter where the reader is presented with a post-structural reading of Molly Bloom as manifesting a harmonization between the vents that unfolded and that which has changed through the journey.

5.3. Departure: “Telemachus” and “Nestor”

Telemachus, you must not be in the least shy or nervous; you have taken this voyage to try and find out where your father is buried and how he came by his end.
– Homer, *Odyssey*

Both inter-correlating characters start their own inauspicious day on the morning of June 16, 1904. Stephen Dedalus leaves the watchtower quarters he shares with “stately, plump Buck Mulligan” (*U 3*) and the uninvited and unsympathetic Haines vowing after a series of seemingly empty and rancorous talk never to return. Meanwhile, Leopold Bloom purchases some kidneys from a Jewish butcher with an invitation to settle in Palestine on the walls, enjoys them for breakfast and shares some with his cat. Having provided his beloved Molly with breakfast and a sexy novel, he promptly leaves her to her lover “Blaze(s)” Boylan.

On the surface, if one leaves out the symbolic resonance of the archetypes, very little happens, as Dr. Jung observed.⁴⁵ Since archetypes play such an important role, a whole array of archetypes is introduced outright, beginning with Mulligan who plays the role of the “trickster”. As a chaotic-neutral character, whose motivation stems more from the preservation of the self and whose deeds whether “evil” or “good” depend likewise, the specific archetype of the trickster is liminal encompassing opposing aspects of the same field or issue in the same instance. The trickster

is both subhuman and superhuman, a bestial and divine being, whose chief and most alarming characteristic is his unconsciousness. Because of it he is deserted by his (evidently human) companions, which seems to indicate that he has fallen

⁴⁵ As noted above see Jung 116; vol. 15

below their level of consciousness. He is so unconscious of himself that his body is not a unity, and his two hands fight each other". (Jung, *Four Archetypes* 169)

Much like Janus, the trickster is able to embody two differing concepts into one as he or she lacks any subconscious aspect to the self, often rendering him or herself into a semi-perceived psychotic or insane nature. Mulligan certainly fits the bill in this regard: he imposes himself on Stephen, bringing himself and a slightly crazed Haines into the tower premises where they reside. Mulligan therein acts as a con, constantly trying to trick Stephen not only out of his money and the keys to the tower itself, but luring him away from the hero's path so that he may arrive at a newfound understanding of himself, to emerge as the artist he wants.

Stephen, when removed from Mulligan's presence, readily recognizes the archetype of the usurper and deceiver, the trickster: "a jester at the court of his master, indulged and disesteemed, winning a clement master's praise" (*U* 23). Indeed, Mulligan as the trickster is more than he seems. Mirroring Judas, his obsession for crowns to get drunk and his black mass within a tower constructed by the English, as well as his urging towards Stephen to compromise his artistic work for Haines, represent a character who is Catholic but mocks the church and who is Irish but sides with the English since it secures his fancies. He utilizes Catholic guilt against Stephen, despite mocking the same institutions and prayer. In an intertextual/archetypal reading, the trickster is also embodied to the reader by the shared world of the Telemachus and Odysseus of Homer, one of the *ur-texts*. When their home is occupied by "suitors", they also are the same tricksters, in it for themselves, having a good-old time slaughtering Odysseus' cattle, drinking his wine, and luring his wife. Correspondingly, Stephen later observes that "a man's worst enemies shall be those of his own house and family" (*U* 185) much as Mulligan is to the tower and the suitors of Odysseus' home.

The trickster is also cynical, used within a tale as a voice which lends credence to the idea that the underlying fundamental falseness of this world is a debased ritual for any side presented. As the novel opens, a false invocation occurs as Mulligan mocks the Catholic mass while waving about his shaving bowl as if it were full of holy water and blessing the tower, the earth, and the mountain, as if seeking something lost in the past and found in myth and ritual of the pre-catholic pagan Ireland, connecting this with the navelstone at Delphi, reciting "the omphalos" (*U* 17).

Whatever the case, Mulligan foils the protagonist of Stephen to initiate his journey onward and must be pulled away from Mulligan to do so.

As may be recalled from the end of *A Portrait*, the main character, the self-conscious hero artist of Stephen, flew away from Ireland to Europe. Following Joyce's autobiographical synchronicities, Stephen has now returned to Dublin. Despite having removed himself to fly on the wings of art, he has apparently failed to do so. His return forces him to deal with the setting he had abandoned and had thought to overcome. To pinpoint the most extreme departure from the Stephen of *A Portrait*, the same protagonist of *Ulysses* is tortured by the recent death of his mother. This usage of the mother as an image in its archetypal form mirrors the shadow, anima, and the overbearing mother itself, acting as a marker of antagonism by which the protagonist is haunted until he can reconcile himself with it by the end of the novel – whereby the mother who eats away the child becomes one who nurtures.

Along this path of reconciliation, Stephen embodies “the basic outline of the universal mythological formula of the adventure of the hero” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 21) which necessitates that Stephen fulfills two concepts: 1) his journey is a microcosm of the larger macrocosm of the hero in its various forms – Stephen (as well as Leopold for that matter) being one of them and taking on the form themselves; and 2) this fact necessitates Stephen as being universal to the hero mythos itself, thereby being equally removed from and part of the character's purely historic construct. Citing Campbell:

[T]he hero is the man or woman who has been able to battle past his personal and local historical limitations to the generally valid, normally human forms. Such a one's visions, ideas, inspirations come pristine from the primary springs of human life and thought. Hence they are eloquent, not of the present, disintegrating society and psyche, but of the unquenched source through which society is reborn. (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 20)

When the novel begins, Stephen Dedalus is at loose ends. The main point of contention that opens the novel is that his mother has passed away and that he is subsumed by the guilt of her death, specifically for not praying for her at her sick-bed. The death serves symbolically as way to introduce the mother as the counterpoint of Stephen's shadow, which continually

challenges Stephen's consideration of himself as the *artist* unlike the previous novel. Contrasting in *A Portrait*, the lack of reconciliation Stephen gained within himself to set himself free of the limiting circumstance of his background has come to drag him down to Earth as an Icarus figure in *Ulysses*. Now, he is unable to neither flee again nor be content in Ireland. Unlike the previous self-confident Stephen, he is left with nothing but a "resentful feeling of inferiority" (Kimball 59). Like Stephen, Bloom also begins a journey to reconcile his character internally – both psychologically and spiritually, as well as externally troubled by his own shadow, represented through his wife and the premature death of his son. Both characters, wandering around Dublin, seeking a father-son motif to be established, all the while haunted by their shadows, come to find one another.

When the spirit of Stephen's recently deceased mother visits him in dream, fantasy and reflection, she is written to be the acknowledged source of his shame and sorrow at "her wasted body" (*U* 5) despite the fact that Stephen is unwilling to confront her. She is a recurring image of a conscious mind into which unconscious material intrudes for "[S]he was no more: the trembling skeleton of a twig burnt in the fire, an odour of rosewood and wetted ashes" (*U* 26). Now, the important aspect of the journey is not just across the seas, but also into the underworld of the dead. She is a deeply threatening figure, the *anima*, sometimes a harlot, often "a witch on her toadstool", "a wandering crone" and "a messenger from the secret morning" (*U* 13). She reminds Stephen of his inability to pursue his own vocation, i.e. to give birth to his own artistic creation, reflecting on the fact that Stephen has purely thrown himself into the father image of art as "the great artificer" without the corresponding reconciliation with the Jungian mother archetype from which all is created.

In Jungian psychology, the *anima* itself is the soul of the female out of the male's control inside of himself. For Bloom, his "shadow in his anima construct" is his wife, on which he "projects" the feminine aspect within his psyche, whom he disowns by his sexual estrangement, following the death of their son Rudy. From this arises the same search for a lost son that joins the theme of Stephen's indignant and distant relationship with his own father as well as their cognizance of their own selves.

In effect, Bloom also follows the literary motif of the “Wandering Jew”⁴⁶, itself an archetype of the wanderer in both negative and positive aspects since he is doomed to wander until the time of judgment when he will be allowed into paradise. The reader sees that Bloom is mocked in Haines’ song, most especially by Mr. Deasy, who brings up the continuing theme of the character being internally torn between origins and coping with their presence. In this instance of racism for Jews, like Bloom who is marked as a Jew who wonders why they “are wanderers on the earth to this day” (*U* 35) and Stephen who is awaking from his nightmare of history, they both wander within their own historicity, trying to escape from it by seeking the eternal. In this regard returning to the archetype of the mother providing the creation and origin of the individual, Joyce makes it clear that this archetype is presented as the antagonistic force according to which Leopold and Stephen must both struggle. It is represented at the start of the novel, when the sea “great sweet mother” who lovingly holds her children to her “white breast”, that is, the “wine-dark sea” of Homer becomes the repulsive “snotgreen” and the “scrotumtightening sea” (*U* 5) of Ireland. This transformation is further exemplified by becoming the wasted northern waters in Stephen’s mind whose “seacold eyes looked on the empty bay” (*U* 28). The sea here is not only the engulfing mother archetype haunting Stephen, but also “symbolizes the unconscious” (Sugg 348). As the metaphoric microcosm of the water imagery occurs, it “draws to consciousness those contents of the ... psyche which [one] has repressed or ignore” (Sugg 348), which is also associated with the shadow archetype. It is clear that Joyce is painting a picture of the mother as one who destroys and creates, and without which

⁴⁶ In the article of the same name by Morton Levitt, both Joyce and the character of Leopold Bloom are “The Greatest Jew of All”. For Levitt, the Jewish images are central in the novel and it is exactly the motif of Jewishness that provides the key to *Ulysses*. “For Joyce ... Jewish perseverance through centuries of persecution serves far more positively, as the metaphor for a continuing potential, a persistent reach toward humanistic goals” (Levitt 148). What is more, “[A]s the Jews escaped from Egyptian bondage into nationhood ... so would the Irish eventually escape English bondage into freedom” (Levitt 148). Bloom may not be an Orthodox Jew, a practicing Jew, or a Jew at all, but he is one in the sense of his origin and his alien identity being ascribed to him. Hence, his archetypal character of wanderer is one of outsider as well. “The Jews, who had been reviled outsiders but who had managed somehow to retain their traditions and beliefs, served as the perfect, positive metaphor for the modern condition, offering an ongoing promise that humanity might not just endure but could even prevail in a time when everyone might seem an outsider” (Levitt 151). This ancient metaphor of “Wandering Jew” obviously inspired Joyce for “an essentially positive vision of modern life” (Levitt 152). Levitt goes so far to propose a possible ending for Stephen Dedalus after his final encounter with Bloom who “offers Stephen ... the opportunity to fulfill his potential” (152). Although we witness Stephen disappear in the night, “[W]e can suppose that at the end of his ... day, Stephen, having discovered at last his subject in Bloom, will go off somewhere to write a novel built around Bloom” (Levitt 152). For a condensed view on the subject, in addition to this article, please consult *Joyce and the Jews* (1989) by Ira Nadel or Marilyn Reizbaum’s *James Joyce’s Judaic Other* (1999).

no creation can occur for either Leopold or Stephen, even though they cannot come to terms with it at the outset of the novel. From this point the “heroes” set out on their journey.

By finding one another, they cease their wandering. They are led in the end to a purified ritual, a libation and a ceremony of innocence: Stephen and Bloom bond and relieve themselves together in the backyard, under Molly’s window, in a ritualized event that joins Christian and Jewish motifs delivered to the light of the moon while gazing upon a “projected luminous and semiluminous shadow” (*U* 608) from the “heaventree of stars” (*U* 603). But first there is testing, temptation and a wrestling with inner demons, which comes prior to this eventual reconciliation.

5.4. Joyce’s Bardism

In my history of literature I have given the highest palms to Shakespeare, Wordsworth and Shelley.
– James Joyce, *Letters*

Joyce’s passion for linguistic experimentation compelled him to assay into the various possibilities of the manifestation of literary, non-literary, commercial, and commercialized, spoken and dialectical, English usage, applying them as inherent to the novel’s expression of storytelling; i.e., Joyce parodies the English used of his time in its numerous forms. As a partial consequence, *Ulysses* provides an extraordinary richness of vocabulary – the writer depending on the occasion uses words from all sorts of jargon: professional vocabulary, street and colloquial expressions. *Ulysses* is therefore one parade of language and Joycean linguistic inventiveness, whose very nature is fruitful and the examination of it in the context of not only its archetypal but also intertextual forms, is pertinent in order to better understand the work, as its allusions are of consequence to doing so.

Much of the intertextual allusions which come to manifest themselves into *Ulysses*, are carried out in the form of the parody, which Juvan defines as “the oldest and most productive among the intertextual types”⁴⁷ (37). This may be seen in the first few sentences of the novel:

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

⁴⁷ „Najstarija i najproduktivnija među intertekstualnim vrstama“ (trans. author).

sustained gently behind him on the mild morning air. He held the bowl aloft and intoned:

—*Introibo ad altare Dei.* (U 3)

While *Ulysses* begins with an ordinary act of Buck Mulligan's (the trickster archetype's) shaving, the whole scene of pomposity and grandeur is nothing but a parody of the Catholic Mass to the close reader who would be able to recognize it. This kind of parody Joyce achieved through a selective choice of words and rhythm to highlight the semi-seriousness of the act though counterpoised to the bizarrely mundane and profane. When concluded by the Latin – *Introibo ad Altare Dei* – used to begin a Mass, it succeeds in becoming representative both metaphorically and a farce unto itself. Overtly, nothing is “sacred” for Joyce, yet, through this usage of parody, as if in a ceremony, the novel mocks the mass to invoke the initiation of an examination of the sacred in everyday life and how it reflects on the inner lives of the characters. The concept of constant allusion to other text enriching this text may also be brought to the fore through an examination of its use of *Hamlet*. Stephen is more than a “modern Telemachus”; he is a “modern prince Hamlet” as well. Taking into the account the theoretical and ideological context of archetypal criticism, the main motives and symbols are easy to recognize when careful attention is paid to the circumstances in which this work is written.

Stephen embodies Shakespeare's⁴⁸ Hamlet, both being heroes of sacrifice, who are led to destruction in the course of exploration. Of course, this rests upon Joyce's own interpretation of the text, as offered by Stephen within the novel, which professes that Shakespeare and Hamlet were both characters searching much in line with Odysseus – for a way home. However, unlike the heroic epic which remains clear,

⁴⁸ *Vis-a-vis* Shakespeare's presence in Joyce's work, it is worth noting that the Bard was “a sort of psychoartistic inevitability” (Pelaschiar vii) and “‘something’ Joyce did not *want* to love so much and yet that he could only love so much despite himself” (Pelaschiar vii). In an interview with José Antonio Gurpegui, Harold Bloom underscored Joyce's “origin” stating that “Joyce is not an Anglo-Saxon: he writes in English, but he writes it like a foreign language: he is a Celt. He is a Catholic, though he doesn't believe in Catholicism, he is raised as a Catholic Irishman. He is Celt, and not, not Anglo-Saxon. That's why he says rather bitterly to Frank Budgen, ‘I would have to take the Englishman’, meaning Shakespeare. Who but Joyce would have referred to Shakespeare as ‘the Englishman’?” (169).

[T]he tragedy constitutes both a challenge and a problem: an archtext for *Ulysses* it stands second only to Homer's *Odyssey*, and it looms so large on the horizon that Joyceans have found it (and still find it) difficult to 'think Shakespearean' without also (or almost exclusively) 'thinking Hamletian'. (Pelaschiar ix)

Stephen is unlike Hamlet and more similar to Telemachus due to the simple fact that the quest to know, the madness driving him onward to discover the truth is not a death sentence for Stephen. Unlike Telemachus though, Stephen represents the modern mind of self-contemplation, but like Telemachus is saved by the encounter with a father figure, and not "drowned" by it by a corresponding father dead and alive. Indeed, Stephen is saved much like Telemachus by finally encountering his father archetype after having searched.

Nevertheless, Stephen cannot escape his semblance to Hamlet and is written as such. He sets out on his journey from the tower, to confront the same challenge that is in front of Hamlet, examining the apparent emptiness to his existence.

Just like the hero of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Stephen is dark and prone to contemplation. In a time interval of essentially one waking day, Stephen constantly revives his Hamletian dilemma – "to be or not to be". However, while the existential challenge of life in one's call to duty is Hamlet's: "Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer / The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune / Or to take arms against a sea of troubles, / And by opposing end them?—To die" (Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 3.1. 24-67) it is of Stephen's to contemplate his own existence as whether the path he has thus taken has been nobler than merely succumbing to its challenges. Stephen has to reach self-realization as a tragic prince, and, as with Hamlet, he is testing his perception of how he views his existence against its reality. Both Stephen and Hamlet also mirror Telemachus in his search for a father who he does not actually know but guides him.

Hamlet, though an English renaissance play, has elements of the modern inside it. Most striking of these is its self-reflection of the character being aware of a time and place unique to the plot and not merely carrying out a repetition of a legend. *Hamlet*, though a legendary story, is presented as being characteristic to its framing within its own structured plot. Hamlet is a character who is aware of the troubles of life and is not merely eking out a reputation based upon ancient or medieval ideals of being a good Christian. Hamlet is aware of the circumstance he has been placed into, and phrases it rhetorically as universality. In this same regard, Stephen is

confronted by the history of his own character, specifically in its misrepresentation and its undue limiting influence on him. When Stephen is conversing with Mr. Deasy, he confesses that “[H]istory ... is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake” (*U* 32), which itself is often cited, without its context. As Deasy is trying to tell Stephen a false story of the way he views Irish history as a Britain, not an Irishman, he represents the way that life should be lived based on completely distorted accords. This is in stark contrast to Stephen, who, in his revelation as the artist from *A Portrait*, is at the crossroads of this novel to bring into agreement his past and his existence, not letting one determine the other. This itself is a sign of the times for when *Ulysses* was written as a reflection on the disillusionment of continual progression caused by the First World War. Stephen, Bloom, Hamlet, and Odysseus are all characters who are faced with the historical reality of their circumstance as well as the ideal concept of what they should be.

This quandary of how the sacred ideal can survive its historically profane existence is the fulcrum which pivots both Hamlet and Stephen. On the “Hero’s Journey” of Campbell, they fit the motif the hero encountering his or her own existence and being challenged by their own existential dilemmas through the journey itself which brings the course of events and its development to a head. As reflected to underscore the fact in Bloom, there is at hand a deeper quandary over one’s existence in general, specifically addressing the identity given through one’s history. In Bloom’s case, his Irishness is always a question against his Jewishness. Even though Bloom finds no value in his own historicity (an Orthodox member of the Jewish community would not eat pork kidneys), it poses a challenge to him despite the fact that he is of little concern over his Jewishness except for the outsider influence it holds over him and which he experiences for generally not being like others to begin with. In short, this historicity is a form of the shadow archetype to haunt the characters of Bloom, Stephen, and Hamlet with their origins against their perceived reality that sets them apart from the other characters of their respective works. In this regard, as these protagonists interact with their settings, the shadow rears its ugly head in a multifarious ways, in fits and spurts. As Pelaschiar observes “*Hamlet’s* shadow can nevertheless cast itself in unpredictable shapes and forms, away from the character of Hamlet and from Stephen and nearer to Bloom” (xi).

In this regard, since Joyce and Shakespeare dwell on the same issue of the historicity of the shadow haunting the present condition of the self through the hero, one must also concur with Pelaschiar’s statement that the “J/S nexus is a universe whose definite borders will always

remain a work in progress” (xiii). Therein, Stephen’s opening appearance at the tower would seem to find an echo of the same challenge that is posed to Hamlet, questioning his own existence and what he is to do with himself, after confronting his father’s ghost. In the same manner, Stephen’s sojourn to the beach to reflect on his existence also mirrors Hamlet soliloquy as he questions all the forms of existence into which life comes and goes. Therein lies the overtly incoherent “[I]neluctable modality” (*U* 34) of the transmutation of the shores of the beach throughout history, where the individual existence is left to rot in the wake of the tide. The dog Stephen observes coming across the corpse of one of its own in which Stephen thinks “[A]h, poor dogsbody! Here lies poor dogsbody’s body” (*U* 43) reflects Hamlet’s “[A]las, poor Yorick!—I knew him, Horatio; a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy: he hath borne me on his back a thousand times; and now, how abhorred in my imagination it is! my gorge rises at it” (5.1. 189-193). Both are whim to the brief existence of their lives, caught in the web of their placement of history, at once their own being, left asunder as a corpse to the living.

The hero must engage and disengage with the story of his or her own making in order to progress from one stage to another. It is a misnomer that the hero, after having defeated the monster, has completed the quest. After every great achievement, the hero obtains the revelation and wisdom gained to take on another path, as has been noted in Stephen’s epiphanies within *A Portrait*. What remains after the initial success is the shadow remaining of the original existence, best embodied in its folksy manner of the phrase “you cannot go home again”. Joyce’s use of the archtext of *Hamlet* as well as the *Odyssey* is to emphasize the non-primitive hero concept of the mere hero who wins the battle, but one who can individuate the achievements of the battlefield against home life. Kimball is of this opinion, noting that “[T]he Stephen who appears in ‘Telemachus’ embodies what Jung sees as the inevitable counter face of the ‘megalomania’ characteristic of the ‘epiphany of the hero’, Jung’s label for the second stage in the individuation process” (59). A memorable scene of *Ulysses* speaking in favor of this interpretation is the morning appearance on the tower, which directly mimics the Shakespeare’s tragedy. Hamlet and Stephen both face their setting against which they contemplate the meaning of their life, particularly from where and from whom they have come from. As Kimball suggests, “the edge of the sea harmonizes with Jung’s figure for this second stage of individuation as a ‘reef’ which the hero must ‘circumnavigate’ to reach the next level of development” (59).

Joyce distinctly draws on a loose correlation of converging the texts upon one another to parallel the motifs, through the use of the symbolic nature given to the archetype. While the character of Hamlet is coming through the walls of the royal castle of Elsinore, contemplating the hallucinogenic spirit of his father, Stephen does the same thinking of his dead mother. Thus, the Martello Tower becomes Stephen's royal castle, or rather "a silent tower, entombing their blind bodies" (*U* 41) as he recalls later in "Proteus".

Stephen stood up and went over to the parapet. Leaning on it he looked down on the water and on the mailboat clearing the harbor mouth of Kingstown.

- Our mighty mother, Buck Mulligan said.

He turned abruptly his great searching eyes from the sea to Stephen's face.

- The aunt⁴⁹ thinks you killed your mother, he said. That's why she won't let me have anything with you.

- Someone killed her, Stephen said gloomily. (*U* 5)

Whilst Hamlet may be haunted by the death of his father, here Stephen is haunted by that of his mother. Joyce clearly intends a parallel from the outset of the novel. These visions are both assumed as real to the characters involved, visions of those passed away – one waking, one dreaming – but they are directly correlated to one another and intended to be so. "The mother image as a paralyzing psychic reality to be feared and rejected finds an echo in Stephen's reaction to the memories of his mother that haunt him from the beginning of the day" (Kimball 85). Here, the mother archetype is presented as such a suffocating influence that Stephen may follow his path of individuation only if he succeeds in heaving it aside. As related to Jung, who suggests, "the growing youth must be able to free himself from the anima-fascination of his mother" (*Man and his Symbols* 71), Stephen here must also grow and transform, thus casting off the suffocating mother. In *Hamlet*, the same concept corresponds to the father, to whom the protagonist feels indebted.

This allusion is taken a step even further, the details of the haunting spirit of Stephen's mother strongly evoking that of Hamlet's father, whose existences, both that of Hamlet's father

⁴⁹ Note how Joyce uses the Aunt instead of the Uncle, the Mother instead of the Father to cross parallel *Hamlet*.

and Stephen's mother, strangle the existence or joy of life out of these two characters due to a duty they feel that they owe to their departed parents.⁵⁰

In a dream, silently, she had come to him after her death, her wasted body within its loose brown graveclothes giving off an odour of wax and rosewood, her breath bent over him with mute secret words, a faint odour of wetted ashes. (*U* 10)

Yet the stench of death and general description assigned to the mother's corpse is of no chance usage since it also serves again to remind of the mortality of the individual, as well as to emulate a more modern description of an awakened corpse in its "funeral veil". In line with the shadow archetype, the specter or ghost is commonly presented in this form, acting as a warning for the truth which is known but emerging. In both *Hamlet* and *Ulysses*, it is a warning of the existence of life amid death; i.e., the hero confronting their current existence.

Yet, while Hamlet's father may call him to depose and reveal his uncle's treachery, the aims of which Hamlet suffers over for the duration of the tragedy, Stephen's merely is that of the accusatory; i.e. to accuse him of his own character, which Stephen tries to reconcile throughout the novel. Both Hamlet and Stephen share in the protagonist's journey, however, seeking redemption for their actions. Hamlet is to correct wrongs and thereby (supposedly) contemplate his own existence, Stephen is to seek answers in his dilemma, but be freed of those who he feels restrain him. Both are constrained by the origins of their existence *versus* the will of the individual, as represented through death:

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

⁵⁰ Ergo Stephen's remark from the "Proteus" chapter: "I could not save her. Waters: bitter death: lost" (*U* 42) might signal of the hero's initiation.

Ghoul!⁵¹ Chewer of corpses!⁵²

No, mother. Let me be and let me live. (*U* 10)

In support of an archetypal/intertextual reading of *Ulysses*, if this section above is more closely examined in comparison to relevant sections of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, a more direct allusion in the referencing one text to another can be better seen through its choice of words and how it is worded, and, by which, the relevancy of examining the two texts to reach an understood accordance between them. To his mother, Hamlet cries out: "Look you, how pale he glares! / His form and cause conjoin'd, preaching to stones, / Would make them capable" (3.4.125-27). The use of glazing by Joyce in comparison to the look or the dead eyes of the departed parent is evidently similar, but the reason of their look is the same, that is to persuade, to torture Hamlet or Stephen into the bidding of their departed antecedent. Hamlet's mother also serves as a reminder of a lack of duty to the father through her active affair with the uncle, thereby boding on Hamlet to also act. Therein, in both instances of Hamlet and Stephen, it is one message that is directly meant for them from these ghostly apparitions, as Horatio observes, "[I]t wants you to go off with it, as if it some impartment did desire / *To you alone*" (1.4.58-60, emphasis added) and as Stephen admits to himself, acknowledging the singularity of the spiritual address: "No, mother. Let me be and let me live" (*U* 10), meaning that her tortured soul only affects him, as the tortured soul of Hamlet's father affects that character, into doing what it wants from beyond.

As if through a lens darkly, Hamlet is compelled to avenge his father by making others repent, through which the openness of his father's death will free him from his bondage, as Hamlet states to his mother: "Confess yourself to heaven; Repent what's past; avoid what is to

⁵¹ Ghoul, the Arabic mythological demon and corpse eater, is also symbolic of the nature in which Stephen's profession is to let the dead rest and not be haunted by his mother. As used in English with "chew", there is also the implication that an existence of over-remembrance of the death of the mother is present as akin to the modern phrase of "to chew something over" meaning to think about. The apparition itself is *the ghoul* who will not let the mother rest.

⁵² What is of particular interest to Orem, and in line with Mulligan's trickster archetype as professing truth without its implications, is that "Mulligan's 'beastly' comment ... may be exactly what triggers the flood of corpse-chewer-vampire associations in Stephen's mind that pursue him through the rest of the novel" (66) especially having in mind the Jungian archetype of the trickster that is presented in Mulligan. "You said, Stephen answered, *O, it's only Dedalus whose mother is beastly dead*. A flush which made him seem younger and more engaging rose to Buck Mulligan's cheek. Did I say that? he asked. Well? What harm is that? He shook his constraint from him nervously. And what is death, he asked, your mother's or yours or my own? You saw only your mother die. I see them pop off every day in the Mater and Richmond and cut up into tripe in the dissectingroom. It's a beastly thing and nothing else. It simply doesn't matter" (*U* 8).

come” (3. 4. 147-202). In much this same way, the ghostly appearance of Stephen’s mother singles him out from the happiness of the living, oppressing him with a divinely sanctioned command: “Repent! Pray! Kneel down!” (U 501)

The ghostly address to both Hamlet and Stephen has consequences on them as characters. Due to the address which only, it would seem, Hamlet has received, the character ultimately becomes alienated from others, not participating in the same world as them. Stephen also suffers from this same fate, since those around him approach all the same items from different vantage points which are inherently alien to Stephen’s. To illustrate, later in the first scene, in the same tower, Buck Mulligan confronts Stephen, telling him, “[Y]ou could have knelt down, damn it, Kinch, when your dying mother asked you” (U 5). Obviously, Mulligan either fails to understand how Stephen is compelled from his own character and will which has been developed at a cost or, more likely, is asserting a cynical pragmatic virtue of maintaining character and paying lip service as it garners better favor for one’s own being to do the task and not care whether it means anything or not. Mulligan is not haunted by anything, and is himself a gallant as in *Dubliners*.⁵³

Nonetheless, Mulligan is a trickster who lends his voice to a certain reality that must be faced. After this dialogue in the tower, it can be seen that “Mulligan’s view of death is not Stephen’s, but it is one with which Stephen must come to terms, and for the rest of the day he will be brooding about destructiveness and death” (Cheng 162). Accordingly, Mulligan, in this study, being categorized as a trickster figure, is on the top of his task challenging Stephen to overcome his fears embodied by the shadow, which is reflected in Bloom through his mentor who is also haunted similarly by a female specter of his own shadow. Together they come to a realization by intimating the shadow with the anima figure as signified in the “Penelope” chapter, the two “principles” which must unite in order to achieve illumination.

Overtly, Joyce uses this comparison to underpin the basic idea of two protagonists who are trying to reconcile their own existences with the shadow that haunts them, as is evident from a comparative reading of the respective texts.⁵⁴ However, shared archetypes and motif aside,

⁵³ “You wouldn’t kneel down to pray for your mother on her deathbed when she asked you. Why? Because you have the cursed jesuit strain in you, only it’s injected the wrong way. To me it’s all a mockery and beastly. ... You crossed her last wish in death and yet you sulk with me because I don’t whinge like some hired mute from Lalouette’s. Absurd! I suppose I did say it. I didn’t mean to offend the memory of your mother” (U 8).

⁵⁴ Examining Joyce’s semi-autobiographical play *Exiles* (or “three cat and mouse acts” as he termed the play), Giuseppina Restivo finds yet unexplored parallels between the main protagonist of the play Richard Rowan and Shakespeare’s characters from *The Tempest* and *Othello*. Although Joyce’s play relies heavily on his early experiences of self-imposed exile in Europe, Joyce evidentially did mention *Othello* in his notes for it. Restivo

more intertextual relationships still arise in *Ulysses* from other texts and ideas. The process of intertextuality Joyce combines skillfully parallels itself throughout the novel, (in)conspicuously releasing his rich linguistic and provocative work from any specific molding and only one frame of interpretation due to its intertwining with texts of the same nature.

It can be accorded that one may draw this conclusion from *Ulysses* due to the fact that it is not a text alone, but rather a deeper reflection of outside circumstances, not only in wider literature, but in the character itself as well that contribute to the overall meaning ascribed or taken by the character and is therefore not mere self-representation, but character self-discovery through self-dialogue. Here, this can be seen in Stephen's emulation of Hamlet.

5.5. Initiation: "Proteus"

The tribal ceremon[y] of initiation ... serve[s] to translate the individual's life-crises and life-deeds into classic, impersonal forms. It disclose[s] him to himself, not as this personality or that, but as the warrior ... the chieftain; at the same time rehearsing for the rest of the community the old lesson of the archetypal stages.

– Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*

The "Proteus" chapter of *Ulysses* is crucial for Stephen "for it is here that he realizes his problem is not to escape from Ireland, but to escape from his own ego" (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 67). The chapter is also where many readers stumble and lose their footing in the book, in part because of the dense network of associations that seem to require consulting a lengthy scholarly footnote at every step. Yet, these references deal with inwardness to the language of thought which is represented through the glory of the stream-of-consciousness style that Joyce utilizes. The Jungian archetypes and the framework of a hero's journey as proposed by Joseph Campbell here take shape through the use of reestablished archetypal imagery that serve to represent a syzygy /conjunction between the conflict underscoring Stephen

skillfully casts light on Shakespeare's presence in Joyce's *Exiles*. Richard's words "I am what I am" (*E* n.pag) in the third act of the play, and "I did not make myself" (*E* n.pag.) are, according to Restivo, an echo of Iago's famous line "I am not what I am" (see Restivo 56). "While Iago is proud of his ability to conceal his intention, to deceive and use his 'villainy', Richard – who in a sense 'conflates' *Othello* and Iago in himself – is ... proud of his courage to expose his innermost drives, the ambiguous realities of his desires and emotions" (Restivo 56). Therein, much like Joyce's *Ulysses*, the play is fruitful in an investigation of characters and relationships that seem archetypal in their form of emulation, adaptation, and repetition. This fact contributes to the overall value of approaching *Ulysses* through a lens of comparative intertextual interpretation based on archetypes.

and the resolution against it – specifically his ego *versus* a sublimation of it.⁵⁵ This conflict, when confronted, functions as a mark of initiation for the story of Stephen embarking on a journey to begin. In Campbell’s view, the journey commences as a response to the answer of the most profound of human questions: Who am I?

In Stephen’s case, there arise two archetypal figures at the outset to bring about an existential crisis: 1) the male part of the psyche, now seen as the Father archetype, the animus, which is judgmental 2) the female part of the psyche itself corresponds to the syzygy of the female archetype, the anima, the temptress. These converge together to wake Stephen, figuratively, from the ego induced persona he has made for himself as the pure artist. Both sides are integral as one conflict between two opposing forces as representations of a double-sided crisis coming to its head. Jung argued that such moments of the antitheses coming together to be crucial in the aspect of individuation where a new attainment of the self may be reached: “[t]he syzygies, the paired opposites, where the One is never separated from the Other, its antithesis. It is a field of personal experience which leads directly to the experience of individuation, the attainment of the self” (106; vol. 9, pt. 1). Both figures therefore appear in positive and negative forms, though the reader witnesses their most challenging, unbalanced and terror filled appearance in Stephen’s thoughts within this chapter as they merge together, juxtaposed. Individuation was Jung’s term for the point when the individual’s psyche is finally able to integrate the opposites within itself that can no longer be hijacked by disavowed other aspects of the self, especially the persona. This reintegration of the self is a journey that transcends the fundamental assigned aspects of human reason, which may be counteracted through the *mythos* understanding of the story itself and not the *logos* comprehension of direct cause. Therein, the “Proteus” chapter is troublesome because the call to the journey has been answered but only after the protagonist has been compelled to leave behind what had been attaching him prior. For “Proteus” it is Stephen’s comparison of his identity that he has somehow forged against the actual background of it. It is his historicity coming to conflict with his idealized persona which are not harmonized one with another. It is the anima of aesthetics but the animus of the artificer – Stephen *versus* his ideals.

⁵⁵ The unconscious concept of Jung is an actor whose nature is not one docile but active within the total self, establishing itself against other parts of the self. In this regard, “[T]he collaboration of the unconscious is intelligent and purposive, and even when it acts in opposition to consciousness its expression is still compensatory in an intelligent way, as if it were trying to restore the lost balance” (Jung 282; vol. 9, pt. 1). The antagonism created therefore leads to the struggle for the unconscious against the self.

In the *Odyssey*, Proteus is a sea-god, who, when reveals truth and prediction when captured, but who first transforms through his many visceral forms when being held. In *Ulysses*, Stephen visits the beach and seems to recount the many forms of life that come and go. In this same vein, Proteus is the sea who takes on many shapes, wherein lies the motif of the “[I]neluctable modality of the visible” (*U* 34), which is to denote the many forms of existence as it comes in and out of existence. Stephen notes “at least that if no more, thought through my eyes. Signatures of all things I am here to read” (*U* 34) at the outset, thereby calling to the reader that this is an examination of the self, his self, against its backdrop, where the appearances of existence arise and fall.

Stephen has no bearing to ground his existence neither within the terror of its own history nor in the expanse of eternity. Therein, he asks himself at the start of his walk beside the sea colored by horror at every step that is entirely internal and unresolved: “Am I walking into eternity along Sandymount strand?” (*U* 34). Since the journey is to the underworld of the mind where the ghosts of the past (*the shadow*) are most likely to take shape, Stephen meets its manifold instance along the way: the “bloated carcass of a dog” (*U* 41) amidst the seaweed, the boulders forming the south sea wall is likened to mammoth skulls, while passing business men discuss an unrecovered body of a drowned man. “Dead breaths I living breath, tread dust, devour a urinous offal from all dead” (*U* 46).⁵⁶

This imagery of death punctuates the worry haunting Stephen of the outcome of his own hereto existence, proving itself fruitless. He feels trapped as a transitory creature unable to control or enjoy his own life, wondering of all the hopes and dreams that he imbibed to create the existence he has floundered in and feeling to be a groundless failure whose time is already passing and whose potential has never been fulfilled. Stephen emptily reflects on his time on the continent: “You were going to do wonders, what? ... Rich booty you brought back; Le Tutu, five tattered numbers of Pantalon Blanc et Culotte Rouge; a blue French telegram, curiosity to show:

⁵⁶ The following chapter of “Calypso” opens with a description of the joys Leopold Bloom has in life, which comes in stark contrast to Stephen who seems to have none except for dread. Even as the “Proteus” chapter ends with the foul smell of urine, Bloom is introduced as: “Most of all he liked grilled mutton kidneys which gave to his palate a fine tang of faintly scented urine” (*U* 48). It is evident that Bloom corresponds in this issuance to Stephen as being what the other is not and *vice-versa*. Bloom enjoys life but cannot bring himself to live it; Stephen “hates” his own life, but forces himself to live it.

—Mother dying come home father” (*U* 39). Not only is he the Icarus who has fallen into the ocean and has nearly drowned like that corpse being looked for, but the mother idealization of his aesthetics has died and the father artificer has called him to return as well.

The collapse of the established balance between the anima and animus, mother/father balance, is the crisis that triggers the process of initiation on the hero’s journey. Accordingly, while Stephen’s mother’s recent death preys on his mind, it is the whole complex of relationship of procreation beginning from the female that needs most urgently to be resolved given the marked weakening and persecutory nature of the Father imago which Stephen also feels abandoned by. Stephen can neither create without the female anima nor can establish a theoretical structure without the male animus. Stephen’s thoughts, tossed between the creation and destruction, make for their dreadfully unbalanced, even hallucinatory quality. It is the Self itself between the two extremes which must emerge and by which the initiation occurs.

Stephen’s impotence without reconciliation between the opposition of the anima/animus, as being subject to life instead of existing in it, is further reflected in his thoughts on the father. He exists in Stephen’s mind as the source of that involved theological discussion concerning the “consubstantial father” (*U* 35), that is, in Stephen’s explanation of the Son as Jesus who was created by God out of the same substance as himself and not by an earthly father from whom he is deeply estranged. There arises from this troubled relationship a psychological complex of no small proportions: “[W]ombed in sin darkness I was too, made not begotten” (*U* 35), Stephen thinks continuing the theological reflection concerning the son and the father, asserting a birth in which by not being begotten, he had no part. In this same regard, the male cannot exist without the female, particularly in terms of creation since the female is that which originates life and not the male, as had been noted at the end of the analysis of *A Portrait*.

Indeed, Stephen is haunted as much by the father archetype conforming and building the existence once it is created as the mother who gives birth to it. Yet it is that awful vision he recollects of the anima that most haunts Stephen since he feels that he has failed *to create*, the anima maintains power over which dreams with their archetypes inhibit him. Therein lies the logic of the dream introduced in the first section of the text as it is a continuing and troubling presence, which he had sought refuge from as well as what the mother archetype represents as being the origins of one’s self, such as all the Irish history and church that troubles Stephen’s mind. This fear of the inability to create as being distanced from the anima/mother also manifests

in physical terms in a horror at copulation. Stephen contrasts his languishment as an artist against the sexual natures of procreation, where even the sea-weed seems to be making love. They “lift languidly and sway reluctant arms, hising up their pettycoats in whispering water swaying and upturning coy silver fronds” (*U* 45). This dread of being unable to recognize the nurturing aspects of the mother archetype as being manifested by the anima/opposite sex is further exemplified in his visions. While walking beside the sea of desolation, Stephen thinks of returning home, remembering his resolution to fare on in uncovering the deep dread which appears in the form of death as a vampire reaching for his mother’s lips and entering her womb. The vampire is an extension of Stephen’s persona, as he feels he is a leach and cannot birth art himself.

Stephen is divided without the mother, now only recognizing himself in a father, of which neither is solidified in his life as a giver but only a taker. Along these lines, Stephen is split. This exact same aspect is applicable to Bloom. The reader need only compare Stephen’s version of a kiss (“His lips lipped and mouthed fleshless lips of air: mouth to her moomb. Oomb, allwombing tomb” [*U* 94]) to Bloom’s from “Calypso”, (“Lips kissed, kissing, kissed. Full gluey woman’s lips” [*U* 59]) in order to underline the nature of a divided self. Both characters feel powerless in this regard until the complementation of the archetype of the “wise old man” in the “Ithaca” chapter through Bloom’s and Stephen’s inter-correlated aspects of revelation of son to father.

Building on yet departing from the conflict established, the last lines – invariably important in Joyce as they signify cornerstones of thought on which chapters are based – portray a sailboat embarking over the horizon. This imagery is essential for both Homer’s and Tennyson’s *Ulysses* as the point of embarkation for a goal that promises a boon to share with humankind, this is the same for Stephen here. This symbolic manifestation of imagery is parallel to Jung’s assertion: “[a] possible synthesis of the conscious and unconscious elements of knowledge and action” (180-181; vol. 9, pt. 1). To this extent, Stephen has passed through a hell which has emerged in its many forms of death, confronting him as being the end result of an unlived life. He is unable to reconcile his self of the artificer of art and its aesthetics with one another. Although he has not come out of hell knowing anything new, he has indeed emerged from it and can confront his fears. At this point in *Ulysses*, Jung’s theory applied illuminates an encouraging outcome, which is “a shifting of the center of personality from the ego to the self”

(180-181; vol. 9, pt. 1). Stephen has been able to distance himself from the ego/persona he has established by going through the protean shapes of all existence, including his own. To this point, he is expressing himself in this chapter through the Platonic world of forms when he wonders whether rising “endless till the farthest star” (*U* 44) will allow him to lose his earthly shadow, so that in an ever-returning and lovely image of “darkness shining in the brightness” (*U* 44).

Despite going through hell, as going through a land of the dead where life has been extinguished and there is no change possible from what has been lived in its multifarious structures, once these fearful archetypes become conscious, they can be resolved. At the conclusion of the chapter, there is a positive forward movement in Stephen’s consciousness as he sits on a rock and looks up at the heavens, returning again to the thoughts of an eternity that began the initiation of the journey where, it becomes more evident that “the hero moves in a dream landscape of curiously fluid, ambiguous forms, where he must survive a succession of trials” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 89). Here Stephen progresses onward, leaving a personal hell *alive*. After gruesome thoughts, he turns his mind to an early and sweet flirtation and realization of a deeply felt need for love. It is next to Molly Bloom’s soliloquy, a wonderful moment of realization: “Touch me. Soft eyes. Soft, soft, soft hand. O touch me soon now. What is that word known to all men? I am quiet here alone. Sad too. Touch, touch me” (*U* 45). The antecedent to this initiation is how Stephen shall reach these aims, first by passing through the many forms of existence as has been seen.

5.6. *The Visit to the Dead: “Hades”*

Hope not ever to see Heaven. I have come to lead you to the
other shore; into eternal darkness; into fire and into ice.
— Dante Alighieri, *Inferno*

As the novel’s initial focus on Stephen Dedalus in first three chapters closes, it turns for the following three to Leopold Bloom. These three respective chapters provide background on the characters and their conflict, specifically how they mirror one another. Bloom is a family man amidst a mid-life crisis from both middling class and level of education; he is also one of Dublin’s rare Jews, the son of a Hungarian immigrant, and, most importantly, has found himself unprepared to cope with the fact that he has failed in both his role as a father and as a husband.

His wandering and even seeking to flee from his problems creates a co-position to Stephen's same struggle.

Bloom's antagonism is uniquely specific but complementary to Stephen's. The main point of antagonism they both share is a distance from being able to approach their own lives due to an estrangement of them as outsiders. Stephen is an aesthete who is reviled by his surroundings and cannot appreciate anything of it. Indeed, it is hinted, suggested, and stated that he is in danger of letting his paralysis turn him into a drunk and respectable Irish gentleman in his father's image.⁵⁷

Bloom is the counterpoint to Stephen. He appreciates life, but consciously stops himself from enjoying it entirely and has been left spiritually impotent not by his outsider nature, which, for all intents and purposes marginalizes him but does not neuter him. Unlike Stephen whose otherness makes him stand out amongst others but petrified as he considers himself to be somewhat of an anathema in light of his un-success, Bloom only has personal qualms about his Jewishness, his otherly origins, and strives even in the face of blatant anti-Bloom comments. Instead, Bloom, while able to approach life more directly due to his wisdom, hinder himself out of fear, not letting himself continue onward. As noted before, Stephen is aesthetically aware and focuses on the lofty, but cannot see the forest for the trees. Bloom is opposite, recognizing reality for what it is, yet not able to actually partake in it.

Bloom's seeming paralysis stems from two emotional crises. These stand in abject contrast when juxtaposed to his otherwise cheerful demeanor. The first crisis revolves around the death of his son and, thereby, the end of his patriarchal line. Meanwhile, the second such crisis is based around his wife's adultery which stems from the first as he is unable to bring himself to be intimate with his wife since this loss.

Bloom's marriage and his virility are the most common subjects found in commentaries about his character. In fact, the single most frequently used word to describe Bloom is "impotent". To illustrate among numerous instances, McKenna speaks at length on the topic, stating that "Bloom speaks in awkward metaphors about his age and *impotence*" (78), or that,

⁵⁷ Leopold Bloom points this out in particular in the "Aeolus" chapter. He, who is obviously written as the caring fatherly soul, remarks on Stephen's good boots, second-hand to him, and got mucky on his beach walk prior, but places his concern for the boy in the company he keeps leading him astray, specifically in meeting with the editor for a liquid lunch: "All off for a drink. Arm in arm. ... Usual blarney. Wonder is that young Dedalus the moving spirit. Has a good pair of boots on him today. Last time I saw him he had his heels on view. Been walking in muck somewhere. Careless chap. What was he doing in Irishtown?" (*U* 130), the allusion being that Stephen is in danger of succumbing to one beast over his form or another.

when referring to Bloom in relation to his fatherhood in the eyes of himself and others, “[I]t is the father who becomes *impotent*, castrated, and conquered” (McKenna 186; emphasis added). McKenna even ventures to assert that “throughout the book, Bloom becomes an image of *impotence*” (169; emphasis added), in the general sense which is underscored repeatedly when Bloom tries any endeavor prior to meeting Stephen. Fagnoli and Gillespie also concur with McKenna, citing the fact that “Bloom envisions not simply his own cuckolding but also his role as *impotent* witness” (201; emphasis added). Still, this criticism seems lacking due to its not taking into account the evidence of Bloom’s sexual proclivity. He not only masturbates, but thinks of masturbation and other women sexually. He even feels a guilty pleasure for thinking of his wife in an overt sexual nature, recalling how Rudy’s conception came from Molly’s profession: “Give us a touch, Poldy. God, I’m dying for it” (*U* 79). The fact that Rudy was born from an instance of primal arousal does not deter Bloom from being sexual or from having sexual instincts for his wife. However, he cannot tear himself away from the same cyclic form of existence obsession that Stephen has shown himself to be prone to, which is why Bloom reneges on any sexual intercourse, in particular with Molly, and does not fault her whatsoever for her seeking sexual release in another. In this vein, Stephen and Bloom are *impotent* as being creatures alienated from the anima needed to create. For instance, although Rudy, Bloom’s son, was not born in good health, Bloom obsesses about the stigmatization of the father according to Jewish tradition (highlighting the outsider origin of the character): “If it’s healthy it’s from the mother. If not the man” (*U* 96). Like Stephen who is obsessed about the artificer and cannot resolve himself to his mother or other women, Bloom cannot with his wife, and, likely, does not have sex with other women for this same symbolic reason. Bloom only partakes in sexualized activities through ways which make pregnancy an utter impossibility, avoiding prostitutes, managing his own affairs and relations with women at a distance.

The marriage itself is again representative of the dual-nature of the anima/animus coming together to form a whole, where one without the other is impotent. In his essay, “Marriage as a Psychological Relationship”, Jung considers matrimony to be “a highly complex structure” (188; vol. 17) which depends on a series of factors though it is and can be an “incontestable experience of the Divine” (189; vol. 17). For Joyce’s representation of Bloom and Molly, it is touching upon the transcendence of this divine nature which must come together in order for the existence of creation to come about and continue onward. What is inevitable, however, according to Jung, is

that after becoming father and mother, “the individual will for self-possession is broken” (189; vol. 17). This is reflected in the double animus nature of Bloom’s loss of a son, even though he has a daughter. The nature of his progression has halted as a protagonist as his animus, which is to say his character, has also somehow reached an end and needs to be empowered to escape its own trappings. To clarify this matter on the nature of marriage and childrearing even further, Jung states that

[t]he relationship remains within the bounds of the biological instinctive goal ... Since this goal is of a collective nature, the psychological link between husband and wife will also be essentially collective, and cannot be regarded as an individual relationship in the psychological sense. ... Seldom or never does a marriage develop into an individual relationship smoothly and without crises. There is no birth of consciousness without pain. (189; vol. 17)

Bloom cannot bring himself to experience this same pain and becomes the wanderer instead, otherwise an Odyssean character who is trying to find a way back into his home and his Penelope.

Bloom’s inhibitions towards life are also reflected through his inability to express emotions to his wife. While Molly pines for a love letter from Bloom, as she had used to receive, (“writing every morning a letter sometimes twice a day I liked the way he made love then he knew the way to take a woman” [*U* 649]) Martha does get one, even though Bloom is incapable of doing anything with Martha in reality, nor does he write her under his real name, rather under an assumed one.

Martha’s letter to Bloom itself underscores the frustrated self-questioning that inhibits Bloom’s approach to his own existence. Bloom in many ways can be seen through many archetypes, but, like Odysseus before he is compelled and propelled homeward, he matches the same archetypal motif of confronting the shadow, of facing one’s fears. This is made more evident in the “Lotus Eaters” chapter. When he receives Martha’s letter, he is scornful of it, thinking “[W]onder did she write it herself” (*U* 69), and merely ponders on its meaning. He is uncertain of what to reply and decides to think it over, underlining the nature in which he, while able to partake in the small joys of life, is unable to do anything further, which can be seen in his

thoughts: “Could meet one Sunday after the rosary. Thank you: not having any. Usual love scrimmage. Then running round corners. Bad as a row with Molly” (*U* 69). Therein, while being haunted of his wife’s infidelity, which mirrors his own inability, he is also unable to rectify any situation in order to overcome the shadow. He remains subject to it, having it haunt him as portrayed as a ghost in Stephen’s case.

Further to the point, Bloom’s shadow is strengthened since he suffers from an indecisive nature which antagonizes himself despite his desire to escape from it, much like Stephen has an indecisive nature in dealing with those around him, especially Mulligan. Bloom, at the outset of the “Lotus Eaters” chapter, in stream of consciousness, is thinking of water and why items float in it, but drifts off and is unable to recall: “Because the weight of the water, no, the weight of the body in the water is equal to the weight of the what? Or is it the volume is equal to the weight? It’s a law something like that” (*U* 63). His thoughts are interrupted and he immediately turns his attention elsewhere. At the end of this same chapter, he pictures himself in a Turkish bath after having masturbated, thinking of his sexual organs and body floating in the water: “[t]he dark tangled curls of his bush floating, floating hair of the stream around the limp father of thousands, a languid floating flower” (*U* 77). While the thought goes full circle, Bloom does not actually achieve anything within this chapter. It is mostly within his mind and he circles within his own reflection bouncing against the surface of his subconscious, aware of the shadow that follows him, but unable to individuate it on the surface. Thereby stands the importance of the episode.

It can readily be seen, when the proper light is cast on its individual parts, that Stephen and Bloom therefore share a common antagonism between the two as protagonists. Namely, they need to reconcile the anima/animus relationship within their psyche and allow the shadow to be seen so as not to haunt them any further.

However, despite this dual reflection, Bloom is also the archetype of the wise old man, who, through approaching Stephen, will find in himself the other animus to free his psyche from the shadow and approach his wife as the head of their household. Stephen will also find a father through Bloom’s wisdom and be able to surmount his own inhibitions.

What is important is that the trickster archetype is overcome by the savior, i.e., the archetype of the wise old man. For Jung, this archetypal character of the wise old man “appears in dreams in the guise of a magician, doctor, priest, teacher, professor, grandfather, or any other person possessing authority” (215; vol. 9, pt. 1). Essentially taking on any form that has an

authority over the protagonist, whatever the situation, what defines the wise old man is that he “appears in a situation where insight, understanding, good advice, determination, planning, etc., are needed but cannot be mustered on one’s own resources” (Jung 215; vol. 9, pt. 2). In this study, Bloom has been recognized as such a character of authority and wisdom to Stephen, who “compensates this state of spiritual deficiency by contents designed to fill the gap” (Jung 216; vol. 9).⁵⁸ Bloom’s insight and guidance establish him in this role, “whose words assist the hero through the trials and terrors of the weird adventure. He is the one who appears and ... applies healing balm to the almost fatal wounds” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 37). Bloom’s fulfillment of this role in its entirety comes at the apex of the novel itself. Whilst Mulligan is the trickster up to that point who is filling in for the father figure of Stephen prior to Bloom interceding on Stephen’s behalf, both Bloom and Stephen must go through their own personal hells before encountering a point on the hero’s journey in which they may help one another and face their shadows. As Jung notes,

if, at the end of the trickster myth, the saviour is hinted at, this comforting premonition or hope means that some calamity or other has happened and been consciously understood. Only out of disaster can the longing for the saviour arise—in other words, the recognition and unavoidable integration of the shadow create such a harrowing situation that nobody but a saviour can undo the tangled web of fate. In the case of the individual, the problem constellated by the shadow is answered on the plane of the anima, that is, through relatedness. (*Four Archetypes* 179)

Therefore, Bloom and Stephen’s journeys interlocking play integral roles into unlocking the individuation of their respective shadows to harmonize all aspect of the self as they are mirror *animi* of one another, but Bloom offers wisdom that Stephen cannot ascertain alone.

⁵⁸ The wise old man archetype can come in spiritual forms as well providing the same guidance. He “can appear so plastically, not only in dreams but also in visionary meditation (or what we call ‘active imagination’), that, as is sometimes apparently the case in India, it takes over the role of a guru” (Jung 215-6; vol. 9, pt.2). This point only demonstrates the elasticity of the criticism that can be applied in its context.

Therein, while Stephen goes through his own *Hades* in the “Proteus” chapter, Bloom goes through his own respective calamity in order for both to meet and begin the return process of the heroes. Bloom’s associated Odyssean travel through Hades is much more of an inner journey of self-discourse that confronts the death of his son than actually a physical descent. Still the symbolic archetype of hell is the process of entering “the underworld realm” (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 97) where those whom have existed still do. In Bloom’s case, it is manifested as “a cemetery where he attends the funeral of Paddy Dignam” (Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 97). In an odd sense, the funeral also mimics Bloom’s inhibitory sense as they are burying a man who had given himself to drink but whose name has its roots in “dignity”, denying the reality of the situation in spite of its apparentness.

This is the Joycean irony expressed as a reality and perceived nature of the situation being counterpoised to one another. Dignam is spoken well of despite the fact that he drank himself to death. In a double-fold manner, this sardonic irony appears again when Bloom’s group ride in a carriage to the funeral, but the character of Mr. Power talks about the shame of suicide, only to be later reminded by Cunningham that it was improper to speak ill of those who have killed themselves as Bloom’s father himself died by his own hand. The carriage ride shows the alienation of Bloom to society, much as Stephen’s, but also demonstrates the desire to be part of it, unlike Stephen. When a money-lender Reuben J. is brought up, a Jew, Bloom tries to engage the others through an anecdote (see *U* 84-5) about him, but it falls on deaf ears and even a partial reprimand by Simon Dedalus. This instance firstly demonstrates the introspection of Bloom into his own life as not belonging to society, but secondly serves to underscore the contradictory nature of existence the protagonists have as the archetype of the outsider. It is done through either the opposition of extremes or their juxtaposition.

To further explore this concept, in the same carriage with the men on the way to Dignam’s funeral, Bloom has this recollection of the moment that he thinks was the exact moment of Rudy’s conception. The fact that Bloom dwells on the perceived moment of conception rather than birth may well surmise the end of his desire for physical intimacy. Bloom’s feelings of guilt, therefore, are inexplicably linked through his fears to conceive again and their correlating action or inaction, to his son’s death. Yet it also serves to symbolize an archetype of creation, when Bloom sees the child-sized casket, which begins his thoughts of birth

and death, one leading from another. Again, this is similar to the “Proteus” chapter of “the ineluctable modality” where many things come in appearance as one.

Bloom’s character comes to the surface within this chapter, to again illustrate his ability to directly encounter the actual experience of reality without the overtly philosophical. It makes Bloom differ from Stephen in the same way that Bloom is able to perceive reality without being disgusted by it, which is the likely point establishing him as the wise old man archetype that can assist Stephen on the hero’s journey. While the latter is unable to cope with the sight of death from his mother, Bloom embraces it and directly and intellectually better conquers it than Stephen ever could. Therefore, he even has a broader and better understanding of it than Stephen does, again an aspect that must be taught to Stephen.

Joyce chooses to present Bloom as a character of totality manifesting extremes of archetypes and motifs. For instance, death and the underworld entirely overtake Bloom and the chapter. This motif even extends to his garb, where his sullen attitude is followed in his thoughts by a burst of stream of consciousness, remarking: “Be a warm day I fancy. Specially in these black clothes feel it more. Black conducts, reflects (refracts, is it?) the heat” (*U* 50). Black⁵⁹ is symbolized, beyond the western color of death and mourning, as giving way to heat – as in the western conception of hell, underscoring *hades*. Joyce utilizes this combined approach through inner monologue, impersonal narrative, quotations and other methods of sensory description to stress the motif and archetype of the character in a total of extremes. In terms of narrative style, it also forces the reader to examine multiple symbolic hyperbole of the same nature to create entireties within the expression of the archetype.

This chapter displays Bloom’s character let free in stream of consciousness, reviewing the concept of finality within the situational archetype of death, particularly how the living deal with the dead, as a cross reference to the “life goes on” metaphor of the living caring for the dead. While the process may simply be spurred on by a moment’s reflection of the body at death and its disposal, it grows to be an analysis of it through inner monologue in which many differing religious aspects are hinted at through the concept of intertextuality and archetypal approach either directly relating to texts or wider cultural aspects. In sum, it converges on itself

⁵⁹ For more on the symbolization and meaning of the color black, see Biedermann, Hans. *Dictionary of Symbolism: Cultural Icons and the Meanings Behind Them*. pp. 41-2.

to represent a circular ritualistic attitude towards death in which the body decays but the ritual of recognizing it by the living continues.

Cremation better. Priests dead against it. Devilling for the other firm. Wholesale burners and Dutch oven dealers. Time of the plague. Quicklime feverpits to eat them. Lethal chamber. Ashes to ashes. Or bury at sea. Where is that Parsee tower of silence? Eaten by birds. Earth, fire, water. Drowning they say is the pleasantest. See your whole life in a flash. But being brought back to life no. Can't bury in the air however. Out of a flying machine. Wonder does the news go about whenever a fresh one is let down. Underground communication. We learned that from them. Wouldn't be surprised. ... Flies come before he's well dead. Got wind of Dignam. They wouldn't care about the smell of it. Saltwhite crumbling mush of corpse: smell, taste like raw white turnips. (*U* 102-103)

Such usage of multiple forms of imagery culminates in overarching modes of archetype throughout *Ulysses*. In the "Hades" chapter, Joyce reiterates multiple forms of death and burial to create an overarching form of death and death rituals to enrich the archetype used and establish its place in the narrative. In these intertwining uses of imagery, a total death and "hades" is reached. For instance, "ashes to ashes" is reference itself to the Anglican burial service found in *The Book of Common Prayer* ("The Burial of the Dead"). "Ashes to ashes, dust to dust" which would naturally be associated with funerary services by the reader; yet, this line itself is a reference to Genesis 3:19: "By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return". While this may be but a textual reference and to Christian services, it branches into the archetypal cultural concept of death. The reference to "in the time of plague" is commonly known to represent a great period of demise and is followed by a reference to lime pits in which bodies were thrown at that time. All these are associations of death in the western world, but the inner monologue also goes further than western association into the "Dakhma", the Zoroastrian tower in which bodies are left to be eaten by birds. What is interesting is that this branches to both cremation (funeral by fire) and other elements, such as water, in reference to Zoroastrianism, specifically in the

Avesta Vendidad, in which only funeral by exposure (read: to the air) is allowed, and not by earth, water, or fire.

I, Ahura Mazda, take them to the corpses; I, Ahura Mazda, take them down to the Dakhmas; I, Ahura Mazda, take them down to the unclean remains; I, Ahura Mazda, take them down to the bones; then I, Ahura Mazda, make them flow back unseen. (*Avesta* n.pag.)

Bloom reflects on this further, recounting how it has been told that death by drowning is best, and perplexed at how to be buried in the air, as is prescribed by Zoroastrian belief. Bloom even brings archetype into the modern age by wondering about if someone has ever been buried alive and why they cannot be fitted with a telephone in their grave just in case (see *U* 100).⁶⁰

Here, this multi-symbolic inner monologue accompanied by its disparate references relates to a multifaceted archetype of “death” or “the afterlife”. Joyce creates an essence of the idea of death that arises as a whole from many emerging into one. Though when investigating this situational archetype, death is not a solid whole or pure anthropomorphized archetype, but a cross section which is arrived at only through the examination of many references in juxtaposition to one another of its physical extremes. Even their intersection does not give or imply one incongruous death, but taken as a whole, “death” is understood regardless. It is evident that Joyce is here utilizing a broad spectrum of differing and varied views, presenting a discourse wrapped in its own commensal understandings as no one character embodies death, but all are part of it within the chapter. Bloom is “experiencing” a death among many; therefore, the archetypal experience of death is related against its many manifestations.

Moving on from the machinations of death as an archetype in multiple but singular terms, the chapter is in service of recognizing the oppositional archetypal experience of life. The contrasting of death and life within the chapter shows that Bloom passes through it and remains alive, perhaps more so than he had been prior to the event itself – this itself is the experience within a narrative of “passing through hell” where the protagonist comes to a realization of the validation of existence through recognizing it in the power of death; i.e., rebirth. Moreover, as

⁶⁰ “They ought to have some law to pierce the heart and make sure or an electric clock or a telephone in the coffin and some kind of a canvas airhole” (*U* 100).

Campbell notes, the protagonist is able to assimilate the universality of one necessitating the other: “At the very end of the *Divine Comedy*, Dante realizes that the love of God informs the whole universe down to the lowest pits of hell. That’s very much the same image” (*The Power of Myth* 145). Therein, even the reminiscence of Rudy’s death is part of acknowledging the existence of life as it unfolds. Rudy was alive for eleven days, but Stephen, who Bloom catches glimpse of in this chapter, is a young man similar to Bloom’s son if he were alive. Rudy’s death does not take away from the world the total experience of living, which is actually Bloom’s main flaw. To be more precise, Bloom is afraid of directly experiencing the pains of life firsthand. While he does experience life in the sense of its carnality, he does not experience the total nature of it or is dismissive of doing so when offered the opportunity. For this reason, the chapter is pivotal in setting Bloom free. The initiation has occurred on his journey of return just as much as the “Proteus” chapter is for Stephen.

The “Hades” chapter ends with a return to the letter Bloom received in the “Lotus Eaters” chapter. While that chapter casts light on the archetypal experience of being lost, the letter received underscores an affirmation of life that is apparent only at the end of the “Hades” chapter. Martha originally writes: “I do not like that other world. Please tell me what is the real meaning of that word?” (*U* 68), which appears as semi-non-sequitur and which Bloom brushes aside as he does for almost all instances within the “Lotus Eaters” chapter. However, after having gone through Hades the same lost indecisiveness has changed within his character, which assumes a more affirmative aspect in relation of the archetypal motif of life *versus* death. Thereby, at the end of the chapter, as Bloom is emerging out of Hades and reflects: “The gates glimmered in front: still open. Back to the world again. Enough of this place. Brings you a bit nearer every time” (*U* 103). He has transformed as character in the experience. Instead of merely dwelling death, he has established recognition of its existence and limitation, but not the limitation of all life. He accepts the death of his father better than prior, commenting: “Last time I was here was Mrs Sinico’s funeral. Poor papa too. The love that kills” (*U* 103). Here also doubles the acceptance that Stephen needs to have of his mother’s passing, as not being a limitation to his own existence. This modicum of realization again establishes Bloom as the wise old man who can help Stephen. The culmination results in an affirmation that explains the non-sequitur of Martha’s letter:

There is another world after death named hell. I do not like that other world she wrote. No more do I. Plenty to see and hear and feel yet. Feel live warm beings near you. Let them sleep in their maggoty beds. They are not going to get me this innings. Warm beds: warm fullblooded life. (*U* 103)

Albeit it is never articulated in the same manner, this instance is partially understood as Bloom's "yes", an affirmation of life, and his "yes" that prefigures Molly's repeated utterances of accepting life even when imperfect, particularly in the concept of joining Molly in bed.

5.7. "Eumaeus" and "Ithaca": Return

The well is the World Navel, its flaming water the indestructible essence of existence, the bed going round and round being the World Axis.
– Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*

Stephen and Bloom are not merely characters who are allowed to sit by the wayside and ponder over existence as it befuddles them. Though they pontificate about every matter, the uncertainty and lack of assuredness with which they approach their antagonisms betray their hidden apoplexy. While Campbell notes that "there is something to be said for those rare heroes and heroines who sit on the undisturbed shore enjoying the intense beauty of the soulrise" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* xlvii), Stephen and Bloom are not these types of heroes. Instead, as Campbell remarks, they belong to

those who must swim the torrents while crying out for help. In all, they are striving hard not to drown before they can reach the safety of the soul's arms. And most who have been so deeply harmed will tell you that, all the while they are swimming, they feel their own soul is rowing toward them with the strongest, deepest of strokes that can only come from One who loves without limits. (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* xlvii)

Stephen and Bloom face the torrent they are set against to emerge from the other side wiser and more complete than the originals they had been, but first they must learn how to move and swim

through their existences, not drown within them. The return section of their journey shows how this develops and cascades into a final emergence of the hero as returning as a complete character.

In his study, *The Undiscovered Self*, Jung discusses the process of transformation, noting that the unconscious can only be made conscious on an individual level and that, as far as transformation is concerned, “nothing has happened at all unless the individual changes” (76). Stephen and Bloom have gone through a transformational experience, as Jung would note, and their selves are not the same as before since elements of the subconscious have emerged to bind with the conscious, waking self. In this manner, they have learned to love the life they have been given and not to feel drowned by it, but this is done when both individuals transform themselves.

As Bloom experiences a break in the second portion of the novel with the indecisive lost nature he had at the outset, his character becomes more determined to resolve the antagonistic dilemmas that face him. This break occurs due to his growing interconnection with Stephen. Both characters represent features in their respective flaws that compensate one another to reach a totality in their character. They are complements to each other’s shadows. Stephen must make amends with his origins and overcome the trauma of rejecting them; i.e., resolving the conflict he has established between himself with his mother and the archetype of the father. As Kimball claims, “[T]he next stage in Stephen’s journey toward the psychic wholeness necessary for him to become a productive artist is the recognition and acceptance of the unconscious dimension of his personality” (60). If Stephen achieves this, it is assumed his aesthetic paralysis can be overcome. Bloom, on the other hand, must acknowledge his existence as continuing in others; i.e., accepting the role of the father archetype and realizing that it can be imparted on other *animi* than his departed son. It is presumed for Bloom that if he can reach this point, he will again take up position as husband and father in his home, overcoming the suitors that betray his domicile.

Stephen and Bloom will come to these points only by confronting “the shadow”, intimating, and eventually accepting it, but, before all, Stephen (true as well as for Bloom) “must abandon his Persona” (Kimball 62). The respective *personae* they have adopted have left them powerless in the face of their shadows and unable to confront them. They need not view themselves both as outsiders to their own experience and existence, which is the mask they wear, but as an integral part of it. This antagonism is the contention they both have been struggling with as characters.

They both complement one another, however, since they respectively embody the shadow of one another, being external and corresponding *animi*. Therefore, closure within their arcs demands they meet one another within the story so this connection can come to pass.

Stephen's Shadow is first exposed in a dream in the "Proteus" chapter proper: "It is the man with the 'creamfruit melon' to offer, the friendly foreigner who will provide the corrective for Stephen's one-sidedness" (Kimball 62). Bloom, envisions melons growing in Palestine earlier, scoffing at the idea of any fertility in the payoff: "Nothing doing. Still an idea behind it" (*U* 53). From a psychoanalytical, Jungian point of view this is "the regular and natural function of the unconscious" (Kimball 62) where two halves are presented as one completing a whole. Prior to the event of their intersection and uniting, Joyce takes great measures to underline their dual effect on one another through such allusions and parallels. These are not just coincidences, as nothing is for Joyce, but substantial in creating two complements in characters that unite in one epiphanical state. As Kimball suggests, "[I]n *Ulysses* the meaningful coincidence or correspondences that link Stephen and Bloom ... are invented by Joyce; they are in the text because he plans it that way, and they are meaningful because he sees such correspondences as meaningful" (20). This matching is the same concept as proffered in Jung's meaningful coincidences, as an extension of the "causality principle", as termed and explained by Jung as "the synchronistic principle" (56; vol. 15). Joyce aims to create an intentional salmagundi of disparate interlocking features that aim to be cohesive on a level that appeals and makes sense to the mind of the reader. Though Jung admits that such a principle is "insufficient to explain certain remarkable manifestations of the unconscious" (56; vol. 15) these "psychic parallelisms", as he calls them, "cannot be related to each other causally, but must be connected by another kind of principle altogether" (56; vol. 15). For this reason, the seeming randomness of Joyce has perfectly aligned meaning when understood in its proper context and assembled together as it appeals to the collective unconscious where the archetypes, symbols, and motifs come to work together as one and act as a reference point to one complete whole. Trying to further improve and provide a definition on the nature of the synchronicity of the hodgepodge of symbols arising to converge, Jung acknowledges that "[T]his connection seemed to lie essentially in the relative simultaneity of the events, hence the term 'synchronistic'" (56; vol. 15), implying that the events also bear meaning toward one another as they occur in a corresponding linear nature, which is unlike *Finnegans Wake* where the events unfold in a non-linear, circular manner. Joyce also

mirrors this fact, having the events of the novel unfold within a day, even though it refers back to a history of the characters. This can be further evidenced by the sojourn of the “Wandering Rocks” chapter where other characters come and go in their own respective anthological stories. Joyce inserts this interlude chapter, most likely, to underline the fact of the corresponding nature of the many stories that fail to interact with one another and, thereby, do not gain the same meaning that the final interaction between Bloom and Stephen will provide. Perhaps these characters of the “Wandering Rocks” have not merely encountered one another yet, as the epiphany that is gained from the final realization of the self becoming a whole occurs in linear nature when all events lead up to it. Jung would support such an assertion as he also views this “meaningful correspondence” as

far from being an abstraction, is a concrete continuum which possesses qualities or basic conditions capable of manifesting themselves simultaneously in different places by means of an acausal parallelism, such as we find, for instance, in the simultaneous occurrence of identical thoughts, symbols, or psychic states. (56; vol. 15)

What is crucial, therein, is that the state of the psyche must have a simultaneous correspondence in order for the synchronicity to occur. For this reason, Joyce has written Bloom and Stephen as sharing the same shadow natures that are converging with one another; i.e., they are made as two parts of one whole whose meeting will result in a final epiphany due to the shared linear nature of their respective stories that have led them to their meeting.

Joyce, therefore, utilizes the development of the novel mainly to focus on the final conclusion, thereby developing the characters until they reach their destination of one another, by which the disparate sections of the novel become whole. This is evidenced by the fact that despite the culmination of the novel as their meeting and exchange of dialogues, Stephen and Bloom do not actually interact properly until the “Eumaeus” chapter, at the tail end of the novel. Prior to this there are multiple instances (at least four) where they haphazardly miss one another, though they do catch sight of one another, or, failing that, it is pointed out to them that one had been present prior.

After spotting Stephen for the first time and pointing out to him to his father at the funeral, Bloom misses Stephen in the “Aeolus” chapter at the offices of the Freeman’s Journal. Later, at the National Library Mulligan and Stephen see Bloom. These instances of near misses are all illustrative, however, of the shadow which is following both characters and which is addressed when they finally meet.

Once Bloom has left the library, Mulligan calls out to Stephen, addressing him: “Come, Kinch. Come, wandering Ængus of the birds” (*U* 193). Stephen has often referred to himself in terms of being an Icarus who had flown away on the wings of art, but this allusion of Irish mythology of Ængus (see McKenna 52), a god who frequently has birds flying around his head and is a wanderer, is more illustrative of Stephen’s itinerant nature, doomed to fly from place to place. This same aspect is called attention with Stephen’s dalliance in the portico of the library where he remarks: “I watched the birds for augury. Ængus of the birds. They go, they come. Last night I flew. Easily flew. Men wondered. Street of harlots after” (*U* 196). Joyce, here, is adding a comment to underscore the inability for Stephen to commit his talents to his calling, instead wandering to avoid the call itself. Joyce also ascribes the term lapwing to Stephen as a faltering bird who cannot fly and who has fallen much like Icarus: “Fabulous artificer. The hawklike man. You flew. Whereto? Newhaven-Dieppe, steerage passenger. Paris and back. Lapwing. Icarus. Pater, ait. Seabedabbled, fallen, weltering. Lapwing you are. Lapwing be” (*U* 189). Clearly, this therein is Stephen’s shadow; the birdlike nature has possessed him to a degree he cannot escape from. Since this is expressed by Mulligan, the archetypal character of the trickster, it further misleads Stephen, restraining resolution but adding to the development of the overall plot and conflict.

To this regard, when Bloom leaves the library he greets Mulligan as Bloom is known to him, but not directly to Stephen. Mulligan offers no introduction, as a suitor in Odysseus’ court; he would rather be the father than let Bloom return, and mocks: “The wandering jew, Buck Mulligan whispered with clown’s awe. Did you see his eye? He looked upon you to lust after you. I fear thee, ancient mariner. O, Kinch, thou art in peril. Get thee a breechpad” (*U* 196). Through having Bloom be of a suspected threat to Stephen, the story progresses onward to have Stephen profess the wanderings of the son in search of a father in his interpretation of Hamlet, as opposed to Stephen then finding a true father figure outside of the trickster. That is why Stephen focuses so much on the dream of being a bird and being fed, as his shadow determines that he

must no longer fly but be fed by another in a nest to develop: “A creamfruit melon he held to me. In. You will see” (*U* 196). When Stephen states this, it clearly implies the *animus*, the artificer or the father archetype as he has assigned so. Mulligan’s deeds and words all imply, much as the suitors having a good time, that he would rather live off of and use Stephen, to let Stephen wander and feed from him. Again, Mulligan speaks truth as the trickster when he directly addresses this lack of a father figure which should ground Stephen as a lapwing: “O shade of Kinch the elder. Japhet in search of a father” (*U* 17).

Mulligan also in his trickster form speaks the truth of Bloom, calling him “the wandering jew” and telling Stephen that Bloom has an eye on him but in a misleading context. Allusion to Blooms existence is even given much earlier in the very first chapter, when Mulligan hums to Stephen in his ear: “I’m the queerest young fellow that ever you heard. / My mother’s a jew, my father’s a bird”⁶¹ (*U* 18). However, these mentions also deem Bloom as doom to have no firm place as much as Stephen, equating him with the legend of the wandering Jew (even though Blooms father is Jewish).

Bloom’s forced wandering stems from his inability to create or initiate as much as Stephen’s inability to do so is the same. To put it bluntly, the loss of his son heralded his loss of being able to achieve any form of physical achievement, especially as expressed in intimacy. Bloom, for instance, always has success elude him when trying to sell advertising space for the Freeman newspaper and, as Odysseus, wanders off to somewhere else for a new stop on his hero’s journey. This impotence correlates to his attitudes and actions in matters of his wife’s need to satisfy her own sexual appetites. Since he cannot and is well aware of the fact, as well as being portrayed as voice of reason and understanding, it could be argued that he is even pleased and relived in the knowledge that someone else is able to take care of that side of his wife in which he cannot come to terms to do so. This marks Bloom as a passive actor who possesses at least the ability to rationalize reality, even when gloom surrounds it, but he is unable to confront his own shadow. Bloom’s shadow is partially manifested as his inability to be a father, but, as he becomes the wise old man archetype to Stephen, this threshold is crossed and the shadow is resolved. Archotypically speaking, Bloom is a father without a son. Symbolically speaking, once Stephen becomes that son, Bloom’s shadow will have been addressed and individuated, whereby he can again become the husband to Molly.

⁶¹ Referencing “The Song of the Cheerful Jesus”, a poem by Oliver St. John Gogarty.

As much as Mulligan manifests the trickster archetype to Stephen, Boylan is to Bloom, as he indirectly misleads Bloom, at least in his marital status, thereby clouding his judgment. Boylan is a more malevolent trickster figure as he is presented in a direct antagonistic, villainous manner. Ellmann even tags Boylan as “Joyce’s villain” (see *JJ* 378) within the novel. Boylan haunts Bloom as a shadow reminding him simply of his miserable replacement while he wanders in search of a way back home which he has been cast out of.

According to Kimball, in order to fulfill the role of a constant reminder to Bloom (the shadow), Joyce needed a “wonderfully named fantasy creature Blazes Boylan” (40-1). As both a trickster and a manifestation of a shadow, Boylan is opposite to the traits Bloom is written to have. Whereas Bloom is a man of many Earthly delights, he is down to Earth and modest in his own way. Blazes Boylan is anything but. As Kimball explains, Boylan is “as real as Bloom and just as close to Joyce’s heart” (41). He is a voracious lover and a character portrayed larger than life when he makes his own few, brief appearances. He comes in like a flash or blaze when in the story to ignite an obfuscation of Bloom’s character since Bloom wishes he could have at least the quality of sexual intimacy with his wife that he thinks Boylan has. Although Kimball is of the opinion that “he [Boylan] may instead be considered heroic in a special sense, that is as the projection of a kind of ideal phallic self, a fantasy of the unadulterated, indiscriminate, physical sexuality that dominates the pornographic letters” (41), Joyce addends the character by mitigating his virile nature through the *anima*’s view. Molly makes it clear that Boylan is not one of the best lovers she has had, especially in terms of being intimate with another. Moreover, she claims she would rather have a nicely written love letter from Bloom than Boylan’s mediocre notes. Kimball herself concludes her view on Joyce’s character of Boylan as

a specialized and short-lived aspect of Joyce’s self-portrait, and the picture Molly paints on him in her soliloquy may stand as a memorial to Joyce’s youthful libido, of which the middle-aged author of *Ulysses* is perhaps more than a little proud, more than a little ashamed, and also more than a little jealous. (41)

Whatever the case may be, Boylan does represent the raw, direct sexual nature which Bloom lacks and never can bring himself to have. Even within the “Nausicaa” chapter, he cannot bring himself to objectify the young woman [Gerty] in front of him, instead pitying her.

The commonality therefore shared between Bloom and Stephen relates to the trickster and shadow archetypes following both. Since the flaws of their respective characters are written to be lacking impetus to address their own failings, being both characters who are haunted by the shadows of unfulfilled expectations of the *self*, they are Jungian *animi* who have manifested the same forms in their respective differing manners. Unable to meet the role of a father to the son, Stephen acts as a representative figure to resolve Bloom's paralysis. Stephen's dissatisfaction with his own drunkard of a biological father and his inability to create as he is unable to merge the father and mother together (he only has a false *persona*) is corrected when Bloom reaches out to him and demonstrates that Stephen is not unique to his origins and has a shared experience with another. The shadow that is individuated in the resolution of the plot is their mutual feelings of guilt; Stephen's guilt for not praying at his mother bedside and Bloom's resonance of the guilt he feels for not preventing his father's suicide (see Schwarz 180). Burgess claimed how "Joyce is obsessed with the mystical identity of Father and Son" (*ReJoyce* 36) in *Ulysses*, making it an archetypal story about the father and son, as well as the quest of both to find the other. Moreover, the characters are linked in their quest to reconcile their shadows, overcome them, and re-establish their selves, which inevitably leads to their eventual meeting in which both are rectified and their shadows individuated, by which the characters progress and culminate their hero journeys.

Before the ultimate uniting of Stephen and Bloom, they appear again at the same time and place of the maternity hospital in the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter. The backdrop is that Mina Purefoy is about to give birth to a son (as it turns out). Stephen is with his medical student friends and Bloom drops by to give his regards to Mrs. Purefoy who has been in labor for three days. Beyond the fact that Joyce recapitulates through the entire chapter history of English language, it is a converging point where Bloom decides that he must take action to guard Stephen against further "slipping into the wrong crowd", as it were. It is of no small note that Bloom decides to do so as a son is born, as he is now in a liminal area between life and death where he is a father and yet is not. He therefore takes it upon himself to fulfill the duties of the father for a son who has none.

Stephen enters a crisis late within the narrative that ultimately acts as the denouement of the action of his overall antagonisms throughout the novel. Although Bloom's crisis has already come to a head and he has partially overcome part of his paralysis by passing through hell, he

has yet to fully resolve it. This point within the narrative structure of the liminal state where there is a new threshold to cross is the final threshold of the archetypal monomythic journey of a hero. In Campbell's sense of the *Return of the Hero* he defines "the problem of the crisis of the threshold of the return" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 192) as being the impracticality of assigning the sacred to the profane, or as Campbell directly states: "We shall first consider it [the return] in the superhuman symbols and then seek the practical teaching for historic man" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 192). The deeper issue, however, is that there must be a success upon which this return takes place. The hero must slay the dragon or steal the treasure, so to speak, and then enrich the practical life after having learned of the sacred through the act. The act itself imbibes meaning and power on the journey which transforms the future and must be done by the human him or herself. As Campbell notes, "[i]f the monomyth is to fulfill its promise, not human failure or superhuman success but human success is what we shall have to be shown" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 192). The issue then is how Stephen and Bloom, who are deft of heroic acts and successes, transform the nature of reality. The answer is that they have succeeded in overcoming their *persona* of the outsider, whose experience has especially allowed Bloom to already have returned to warn Stephen of the same path that should be avoided.

A threshold itself is crossed that reestablishes the nature of Bloom and Stephen as characters within the "Circe" chapter, where Bloom calls out to Stephen by his first name.⁶² This itself is initiated by violence when Stephen is hit by an English soldier after a drunken confrontation, as Stephen finally speaks out against a father figure of the king. These actions themselves are the end result of the first section of the novel in which Stephen is prisoner within an English tower, used by a trickster, and oppressed by himself and others in his self-achieved abilities as an artist. Here, his money wasted on others, and assaulted to the final straw, he finds himself through a small act of confrontation, rebelling against every act within the tower of the first chapter. He does not mince words for England. He is directly confrontational with a "suitor" figure who is occupying his country. Stephen also outright refuses anymore to be haunted by his mother at Bella Cohen's bordello where her accusing spirit comes to him in a drunken vision and

⁶² "BLOOM: Eh! Ho! (*There is no answer; he bends again.*) Mr Dedalus! (*There is no answer.*) The name if you call. Somnambulist. (*He bends again and, hesitating, brings his mouth near the face of the prostrate form.*) Stephen! (*There is no answer. He calls again.*) Stephen!
STEPHEN: (*Groans.*) Who? Black panther. Vampire. (*He sighs and stretches himself, then murmurs thickly with prolonged vowels.*)" (U 521).

demands to yield and that he pray on his knees. Thankfully, Bloom is there to assist Stephen as otherwise this would be his undoing. Therein, he takes the archetype of the wise old man and is able to save Stephen. Bloom also is able to express directly intimacy and closeness with another, when he uses Stephen's first name in address. What is more, as Stephen was reminded of the nightmare of the panther of the Englishman Haines by the confrontation, Bloom also takes Stephen under his wing finally, as Stephen's own vision portended. Bloom extends assistance to save Stephen, paying the Brothel for the damages Stephen wrought; then, he comes to Stephen's aid after his loss of consciousness. All of these factors lead Stephen to acknowledge Bloom and *vice versa*.⁶³

The integration of these two protagonists allows for the final resolution that unfolds, since the shadows of these characters come to the light of epiphany. As Jung would term this action, "[O]ne does not become enlightened by imagining figures of light, but by making the darkness conscious" (265; vol. 13). The individuation of the shadow at the end comes full circle in wonder of its combination of qualities from spiritual and psychological archetypes that seem at last balanced after Stephen has been caught from a fall. Thereafter, Stephen and Bloom's return home is at once a strengthening of Stephen's inner self over a deeply disturbed ego. It is a resolution of the crisis witnessed earlier. As opposed to "Circe", the "Ithaca" chapter is so rich in wonder and good natured laughter that one almost forgets that each item raised by the catechistic structure to epic proportions was formerly experienced as painful. Indeed, this chapter is so amiable in its structure that the light which illuminates the darkness of the shadows that were most prominent formerly in the "Proteus" and "Hades" chapters of the work is almost too easy to miss. The resolution shows Jung's archetypes at their harmony of opposition in the *anima/animus* balance of the psyche, wherein the shadow comes to the conscious. In Campbellian terms, this is the point of the journey when "the hero-quest has been accomplished, through penetration to the source, or through the grace of some male or female, human or animal" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 179). In the case of Bloom and Stephen, it is both the penetration to the source and finding grace in one another.

The mutual quests of both Bloom and Stephen seemingly end when they are together at Bloom's home. Much like Odysseus finally returning to Ithaca to bed down with Penelope, Bloom does so with Molly, and Telmachus, now anointed as his own man, departs. Stephen,

⁶³ See Schwarz pp.160-188.

likewise, does the same as his character and his self have been affirmed. Together, the hero and his spiritual son have a moment of repose before engaging in a chat, listening to the sailor who came down from the ship Stephen had watched at noon (the same ship supposedly looking for the dead body). As they prepare to find a hospitable bed, though Bloom has one at home, Stephen, although offered to stay overnight (a happy circumstance for a single bohemian), proudly refuses. Bloom's hospitality is therefore limited to a cup of cocoa. The two men have grown close and now have to move away from one another in order to establish their own journeys which transform their own lives.

Bloom begins atonement between the shadow and the conscious by citing the light of the moon. He draws an unsaid allegory between the contentious anima and animus nature of Stephen and Bloom against women *anima* figures of their respective lives. As the sun is Bloom and the son is Stephen, the moon is woman. One need only follow the humorous exchange Bloom gives when remarking on the moon, beginning with him explaining the connection between women lovingly described as "her omens of tempest and of calm: the stimulation of her light, her motion and her presence: the admonition of her craters, her arid seas, her silence: her splendor, when visible: her attraction, when invisible" (*U* 607). Bloom uses the moon as point of reference, of maternal light which Stephen is alienated from and Bloom cannot come to terms with. At that point a light goes on, and we enter that "splendor" that Campbell promises at the end of the spiritual/psychological journey to wholeness.

Bloom and Stephen in this exchange are carrying out a healing and deeply symbolic ritual of uniting the father with the son and *vice versa*, as well as incorporating the anima figure back into their selves. This begins with Bloom lighting a small torch and Stephen exiting with his hat on an ashplant, chanting Psalm 113 in Latin: "The 113th, *modus peregrinus: In exitu Israël de Egypto: domus Jacob de populo barbaro*" (*U* 603) of the mass which is balanced by its celebration of the Hebrews being led out of Egypt and to the Promised Land – parodying the concept that they have reached the promised land themselves. As related to the pillar of light that guided the Hebrews on their 40 year wanderings, there is suddenly a numinous light which illuminates the darkness of their previous day:

What spectacle confronted them when they, first the host, then the guest, emerged silently, doubly dark, from obscurity by a passage from the rere of the house into the penumbra of the garden?

The heaventree of stars hung with humid nightblue fruit. (*U* 603)

That light illuminating the darkness leads in turn to an extended and satirical passage of grandiosity based in haphazard scientific jargon, in which the most mundane observations and thoughts streaming through the mind are objectified and elevated to an absurd degree, so that the fates of the living and the dead float through the stars. Bloom and Stephen find solace within the fact that the eternal clockwork of the heavens grants their existence substantive meaning even in the face of life and death: “[t]he attendant phenomena of eclipses, solar and lunar, from immersion to emersion, abatement of wind, transit of shadow, taciturnity of winged creatures, emergence of nocturnal or crepuscular animals, persistence of infernal light, obscurity of terrestrial waters, pallor of human beings” (*U* 606). While Joyce had written both protagonists to be tortured by their place within the existence of the eternal, where Stephen was trying to awake from the history that was haunting him and Bloom carried out little to counteract the torture of his own historical nature, they have both found recompense within the knowledge of the eternal accord of humanity coming and going. This occurs only when the shadow of their history has surfaced and individuated. The recognition of ancestry and descendancy, as being one animus among many, which is now recovered, leads in the end to a kind of integration and wholeness, each hero strengthening the other when their true selves are on display. This is evident by the passage when the moon and the stars are underscored as “each contemplating the other in both mirrors of the reciprocal flesh of theirhisnothis fellowfaces” (*U* 607). What is more, while looking ahead and above at a controlling, recurring image of a play of light emerging from darkness that symbolizes the shadow revealed the two men urinate by torchlight looking ahead. Their gaze is “elevated to the projected luminous and semiluminous shadow” (*U* 608) while above “[A] star precipitated with great apparent velocity across the firmament from Vega in the Lyre above the zenith beyond the stargroup of the Tress of Berenice towards the zodiacal sign of Leo” (*U* 608). Here, the act of urinating together is a symbolic source of connection, where both men are able to accept the mundane reality of their existence, taking pleasure in it and being able to reflect on it philosophically (something exactly Stephen was incapable of doing without

Bloom, although Bloom was entirely). Side by side, Stephen and Bloom unconsciously participate in a ritual event of the hero reuniting home, literally marking their territory as educated beasts. This act resonates back to the dog of the “Proteus” chapter, which reappears throughout the text (see Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 178) and darts in and out of the narrative.⁶⁴

The importance of the penultimate concluding chapter lies in the fact that Stephen recognizes Bloom’s “past”, which allows him to learn from another, permitting Stephen to recognize his own shadow of not being able to integrate his past with his present. While Bloom alternatively sees Stephen’s future, he also recognizes that the past need not determine the future or the present, so that he may take action in his own life. Immediately after this realization between the two, their paths again diverge. Odysseus has returned home to Ithaca, Bloom to Molly, and the characters have reached their end but have been transformed by the events.

Still on the threshold, the Hamletian dilemma is set for Bloom: “To enter or not to enter. To knock or not to knock” (*U* 575), but it is merely rhetorical as Bloom knows how to conquer the suitors. Joyce even goes so far as to have Bloom more directly parrot Odysseus in modern language, matching the character and the motif of the hero as he is to return home and set his domicile right. Bloom’s response itself makes it apparent that he has diverged from the inconstant lotus eater form of himself at the outset: “From outrage (matrimony) to outrage (adultery) there arose nought but outrage (copulation) yet the matrimonial violator of the matrimonially violated had not been outraged by the adulterous violator of the adulterously violated” (*U* 636). His resolve to Molly also leads to the latter’s affirmation of his being transformed into one who, figuratively, throws out the suitors from the home and reclaims his own identity instead of rejecting it by accepting the totality of his self.

As for that boon that Campbell promised, “Bloom goes in through the cellar door. The secret master, he knows this door is open” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 178) much like Odysseus going in through the back door to reclaim his home. According to Campbell, the backdoor entrance is symbolic of a character that has attained the transformative aspect in the narrative. Therein, “[T]he door is open to the goddess of the world – namely, Molly – but only the one who knows how to enter can enter” (*Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 178), and Bloom

⁶⁴ In the “Proteus” chapter, the act of the dog’s urination is given the following description: “He trotted forward and, lifting his hindleg, pissed quick short at an unsmelt rock. The simple pleasures of the poor” (*U* 43). Now, both Bloom and Stephen partake in the same simple pleasures.

knows. He has always known but has been made to “remember it”. As both Bloom and Stephen are alienated from anima figures, the direct intimacy Bloom delivers to Molly serves also as a physical and direct symbol of such, as with the sun, moon, and stars. “[H]e kissed the plump mellow yellow smellow melons of her rump, on each plump melonous hemisphere, in their mellow yellow furrow, with obscure prolonged provocative melonsmellonous osculation” (*U* 638).

Stephen, however, leaves his newborn “father”, while Bloom remains to watch the rising of the sun: “The disparition off three final stars, the diffusion of daybreak, the apparition of a new solar disk” (*U* 610). The three stars which Bloom watches as they disappear, thereby, symbolically represent himself, Stephen and Molly as they have been reunited. The “new solar disk”, additionally, hints at the artist who is knowable to commit to his aesthetics and give birth as part of a whole, not merely the disguised persona of an artist.

5.8. The Very Own Penelopiad of Molly Bloom

Where shall I begin? There are only two choices: at the beginning or not at the beginning.
– Margaret Atwood, *The Penelopiad*

As has been discussed thus far, the three chapters that precede “Penelope” bring an end to the hero’s journey with the protagonists’ return. Mirroring the *Odyssey*, Bloom’s victory over the suitor(s) of Blazes Boylan and his final entrance to the warm bed with his Penelope closes out the main narrative, but not the entire novel. As the story ends, so does the myth of an exhausting and troublesome return home, but the adventure itself contains an epilogue that aims to further clarify the interpretation of the text itself as regards what has been told of Bloom. Joyce uses the *Odyssey* as a structural framework in the loosest sense of the term, but here offers a section unfound which would be how Penelope and Odysseus would change after the return of the hero.

After Stephen and Bloom who are “preoccupied throughout the day with the ‘why not?’ and ‘how?’ of creation” (Kimball 116), the last chapter and portion of *Ulysses* are dedicated to Leopold’s wife, Molly. Awakened by the late return of her husband, she offers her own soliloquy that further reinforces the confrontation of the shadow by intimating with the anima. Molly serves as the anima figure that had been alienated to both characters until the climax of the

narrative. By focusing the centrality of the story on the anima figure who supposedly is then reconciled and intimated, the text empowers the mother figure who can now create and nurture, which had been denied earlier. The anima or mother archetype is allowed to give birth.

Throughout much of the work, Molly is subject to the male gaze, whereby she is often seen as both the *damsel* and selfish *temptress* as she is hardly a model for Penelopean fidelity, giving herself away to Boylan. However, she does symbolically wait for her husband and return to him in words. When it comes to archetypal criticism, Molly stands as a figure for an Earth Mother – a symbol for Jungian or Freudian criticism (see Williams 545). There is no doubt that Molly is also the embodiment of the archetypal personality of the Anima, in sheer contrast to her husband Leopold who is in Jungian terms the representation of the archetypal personality of the Shadow (see Kimball 112). She is proud of her husband, but at the same time, she is also unsatisfied. This is not only so in matters of sexual intercourse, since, as a whole, Molly seems, like the other two, to be lacking a reliable animus/anima pairing in her life. In contrast, there is no shadow to speak of except for acknowledging the strain of her matrimony that needs to be reconciled with her husband returning to his corresponding animus role. For all other thoughts, she is frank and honest, almost overly in-tune.

All of this, however, only comes at the end of the novel, after Molly's 2500 word, unpunctuated, uninhibited, and sometimes even self-contradictory monologue, i.e., soliloquy. *Ulysses'* last forty-five pages are utilized as space for Molly's own wandering. Unlike her husband's, Molly's journey is exclusively within her rambling mind as she lies next to Leopold, and at the same time "reveals the nature of her relationship with Bloom ... that in many ways foreshadows the direction of male-female relationship in the twentieth century" (Kimball 112). She shows her complexity through her riddle-like nature. At moments, she is in opposition to all, including herself, while she could also come across as overtly willing.

Since Molly cannot get back to sleep, countless images pass through her head, most of them being the earthly nature she herself incarnates in a multitude of forms. The chapter could be also referred to as the last gospel of the earth, the one that unites two universal principles at the same time – Stephen and Bloom, whose symbolical uniting is presented in the control of the same woman, the same anima figure. The promise of her anima figure is observed in her approach to the world: "Molly does not merely ask the question about creation and suggest that the answer lies in an acceptance of the natural order of the created world" (Kimball 116).

Therefore, when it comes to “a gender exchange”, or more precisely, relation of the Shadow (Bloom) and the Anima (Molly), as well as the Ego (Stephen) and the Anima, “she [Molly, Anima] ... embodies the solution for both men” (Kimball 116).

Meanwhile, the “yes” she inaudibly mumbles at the story’s beginning to note a state of surprise against what is normal as “he never did a thing like that before” (*U* 640) and her clear “yes” at the end which accepts a transformed Leopold Bloom sets her apart as a complete woman. These two forms of “yes” are counterpoised against each other but are merely two among a numerous many that gauge the thought process of how this decision is come to. Therein, the language of “yes” which evolves Molly’s thought process functions as a means to engage the character, as Molly herself develops in her presentation as a character. Molly’s own antagonism is not only overcome in this soliloquy, it provides depth and arc to her character.

Every peppering of yes, from the commencement to the conclusion, gives its own unique instance of meaning while still being the same word to reflect the mood of the character’s thought as it changes. Though evidence need not be provided to support such a statement, Joyce must have thought himself devilishly clever to have done so. Therefore, the mere usage of “yes” throughout Molly’s arcing development where affirmation is achieved as a rising mood of acceptance deserves its own separate examination.

If applied to Joyce’s meandering use of “yes”, archetype as manifested in its forms can be seen as being also individually represented as a sign to a greater symbol. Therefore, when extending archetypal criticism to semiotics and semiology, the essential concept of archetype is relevant as they share the same theoretical nature where the archetype manifests itself in individual symbols but remains part of the overall archetype. In similar manner, the signifier and the signified co-exist, where the sign points to them both, but is inherent to the signified as a representation of it. The actual substance of what the symbolic and the semiotic involve or imply shall be taken as the theoretical concept demonstrating the interdependency of these two levels at which the literary text operates or the underlying foundations of archetypes (i.e., signs), be they structural, thematic, or figurative.

Since Molly Bloom is a character of pure voice, who better than Julia Kristeva to apply to analysing the anima figure of Molly? Kristeva herself notes that the concept of a being can be manifested through its language as it is spoken which interrelates both the individual and the society, claiming language as such “produces speaking beings who emerge in that fold between

language and culture” (McAfee 1). Moreover, Kristeva’s insight into the female casts a more substantive light on “a sort of psychoanalysis of women ... in which she presents a mother-centered realm of the semiotic as opposed to the symbolic” (Guerin et al. 230) echoing the contradictory earth mother nature that Molly ascribes to herself within her thoughts, as wife and mother who is also her own individual. To wit, even the discrepancy of mother and wife that Molly does profess share the regard of Kristeva who argues that “the semiotic realm of the mother is present in symbolic discourse as absence or contradiction, and that great writers are those who offer their readers the greatest amount of disruption of the nameable” (Guerin et al. 230). Bearing this in mind, Kristeva’s theories of semiotic and symbolic shall be applied to the “Penelope” chapter of the novel.

The most important of Kristeva’s theories of signifying process – the symbolic and the semiotic – may be here utilized to explore Molly’s soliloquy. In this regard, one specific feature which this portion will address is Kristeva’s unique way of analyzing literary text by employing terms of *phenotext* and *genotext*, to describe two aspects of a literary text, and how they relate to Molly’s soliloquy.

*

Kristeva, among other members of the *Tel Quel*, came under the great influence of Lacan’s psychoanalytical theories, which search for the underlying mental foundations of how semiology functions. Lacan’s own approach to psychoanalysis depends on the act of the sign and signified, as, if it does not, then it cannot function as the code to unlock the subconscious nature of thought. Lacan also insists that language possess an inherent meaning unto itself as a dialogue is born out in the process of psychoanalysis based upon the signs given by the patient, in which he or she is attempting to signify a psychosis and which necessitates that the language and expression used bears meaning alone. In Lacan’s associated semiotic view, therefore, the “means are those of speech, insofar as speech confers a meaning on the functions of the individual; its domain is that of concrete discourse *qua* field of the subject’s transindividual reality; and its operations are those of history, insofar as history constitutes the emergence of truth in reality [*riel*]” (Lacan 258). Broken down, language works as a manifestation of the confirmation of the perceived reality of the individual, either personally or socially. As such, given this basis, it may be expected that Kristeva’s semio-analytics draws on the same psychological exploration of symbolic and semiotic expression. Her understanding of the semiological meaning naturally and

inherently expressed in communication, in language's generation and expression, is something she describes as belonging to the basic ideas of *Genotext* and *Phenotext*.

According to Kristeva, two modes of the signifying process lead to the appearance of a divided/dual subject between the symbolic (the phenotext) and semiotic (the genotext); "The symbolic can never be completely devoid of the semiotic" (McAfee 24) much as the symbol of the archetype can never be removed from the collective unconscious. However, for Kristeva, the manifestation of expression is uniquely bound to the desire of what is intended to be expressed, whose bare association stems from the original thought, or impetus to expression (i.e., the signifier), resulting in the signified (e.g., the drive gives rise to the signified through expression). This concept is again comparable to the manifestation of the archetype through its individuation as a translatable form into a physical or relatable construct. Jacobi notes this position, asserting that "[T]he word 'translate' refers to that spontaneous activity of the psyche which we hitherto been able to account for in materialistic or biological terms, and which bears witness to its ultimately spiritual ... character" (*Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 47-8). However, the rub lies within the fact that since the expression first demands the origin of a desire or drive to differentiate the signified from the signifier, and since such origin may be alluded to, there is no perfection in communication expressing the original intention or thought of signifier and signified. Kristeva therefore examines the meaning to which the expression of the signifier into the signified takes place, and any importance it may hold as a primary mover or cause. Jacobi also confirms the same impermanence to the nature of the archetype, insisting that only its root cause can be assumed for its total meaning and that their actual manifestation of it in its form is but one of its shapes. She notes that "archetypes are not inherited representations, but inherited *possibilities* of representations" (Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol* 52). Therefore, there is a shared basis for Kristeva's theories within the scope of archetypal criticism.

As opposed to Jung's collective unconscious as being the shared originator of the archetype, for Kristeva, the underlying drive for expression is part of the overall *thetic* (thought) process in which expression is formed and from which it derives, giving rise to meaning and speech in semiology through a semiotic function between a sign and signifier:

The thetic phase of the signifying process is the 'deepest structure' of the possibilities of enunciation, in other words, of signification and the proposition.

... There is no sign that is not thetic and every sign is already the germ of a 'sentence' attributing a signifier to an object through a 'copula' that will function as a signified. (Kristeva 183)

Yet according to Kristeva, there need not be any perfect articulation of signifier into signified in order to create the expressed or desired content of meaning. Unlike an archetype, which is by default a direct representation of itself and merely subject to its form, Kristeva's semiotic limits the manifestation of the actual symbol or sign to its imperfect physical form. Therein, as concerns speech, there is a limitation based upon, among other factors, verbal structures in which the *thetic* may form into place as expressed content; i.e., final signified. What is important is that the semiological body of the original meaning holds place firstly inside the thetic phase, as a psychosomatic process, but which encounters difficulty upon its birth into physical expression. Notwithstanding, the thetic process aiming to the phenotext does "connect the zones of the fragmented body to catch other and also to 'external' 'objects' and 'subjects', which are not yet constituted as such" (Kristeva 182). As Kristeva affirms, "[T]his type of relationship makes it possible to specify the *semiotic* as a psychosomatic modality of the signifying process; in other words, not a symbolic modality but one articulating (in the largest sense of the word) a continuum" (182). Naturally, Kristeva is accounting for the imperfection of human speech to manifest the expression, which is applicable to any verbal structure.

As Kristeva notes, by not concentrating solely on either the origin in the thetic intention or drive of expression nor the result of it in communication allows for an interpretation of meaning that accounts for language in its "expression" from its origins to its (mis)interpretation. Instead of a singular or direct, top-down analysis, she insists that both come into consideration to reach a semiotic understanding based on the original symbolic which will create a totality of intent and meaning combined. This concept may be viewed as a further retooled version of the archetypal analysis used thus far where both the shape and form of the archetype as well as the archetype itself are combined to derive a final meaning. In order to mark this separated nature inherent to the language of a text, however, Kristeva introduces two new terms: *phenotext* and *genotext*. The former is the essence of a text attached to the language as a means of communication, which aims for explanation and presents itself as a representation of a unified theme (see Kristeva 87); i.e., the language as formed to be expressed. *Genotext*, by contrast,

originates from the unconscious, and is differentiated through its rhythm, melody, and repetition – the parsing of a language, as it were (see Kristeva 86); i.e., language in its origins of expression. The former may be viewed as the physical manifestation, while the latter as the ideal form prior to its expression.

Kristeva's theories strive to explain the distinction between the function of a language as a means of expression and the desired semiotic output coming as an inherent imperfection in the process. To further clarify this point, note that Kristeva defines *phenotext* "to denote language that serves to communicate, which linguistics describes in terms of 'competence' and 'performance'. The phenotext is a structure (which can be generated, in a generative grammar's sense); it obeys rules of communication and presupposes a subject of enunciation and an addressee" (Kristeva 121). Here, then, can be read that *phenotext* is Kristeva's definition of language as a means through which the intended linguistic expression takes form, not necessarily the essence *a priori* of an entity used in communication but the underlying "physical" structure giving definition to the expression of thought – nevertheless, still not the thought itself, which has its own origin(s). In the nearing analysis proper of Molly's soliloquy, the form taken (phenotext) clearly breaks from the common assigned literary grammatical form to focus on the genotext – origination of the idea.

It must not be supposed though that Kristeva considers *phenotext* as being the exclusive essence or drive allowing semiotic expression to emerge; rather, it is merely the form in which the language exists or comes into being. It is a means to expression in and of itself. "Essence" lies in *genotext*, as it is original in the language's creation. *Genotext* is the first being of thought or the desire of an idea that needs to be given birth to in the language as form, not simply idea. It is the drive from which all semiotic understanding in communication stems. For Kristeva "the genotext can thus be seen as a language's underlying foundation" (121), as it is not limited in form but rather lets other forms of language use it to take shape. *Genotext* is not a form or a means but "a process; it moves through zones that have relative and transitory borders and constitute a path that is not restricted to the two poles of univocal information between two fully fledged subjects" (Kristeva 121).

Therein, given their interdependency, neither *phenotext* nor *genotext* may operate upon a singular measure, but instead interoperate to achieve "language" or "expression". Kristeva notes that *phenotext* "is constantly split up and divided and is irreducible to the semiotic process that

works through the genotext” (121), and further goes on to state that “the signifying process therefore includes both the genotext and the phenotext; *indeed it could not do otherwise*” (122, emphasis added). In truth, both *phenotext* and *genotext* are needed to achieve the end result of expression, as neither is flawless due to natural limitations: “Multiple constraints ... stop the signifying process at one or another of the theses that it traverses” (Kristeva 122). Their relation should therefore be seen as one of a process establishing an interwoven end.

According to Kristeva, the total potential of *genotext* is especially “set free” in modern works of fiction, as “only certain texts of the avant-garde (Mallarme, Joyce) manage to cover the infinity of the process” (122). Owing to the fact that her theories of the semiotic and the symbolic establish a foundation upon which thought erupts into active expression (speech, literature, other verbal and non-verbal forms of linguistic representation), this statement of “avant-garde” literature being the variety best at presenting the flow of *phenotext* and *genotext* is based on the fact that these texts aim to show the process of thought as it emerges thereof.

Therefore, the basis of Kristeva’s theories of the symbolic-phenotext and the semiotic-genotext levels of understanding may be reliably used in archetypal criticism to clearly analyze the process of an emergence of affirmation throughout Molly Bloom’s soliloquy.

5.8.1. The Infamous Yeses of Molly Bloom: A Reading of James Joyce’s “Penelope”

[y]es because a woman whatever she does she knows where to stop sure they wouldnt be in the world at all only for us they dont know what is to be a woman and a mother[.]
– James Joyce, *Ulysses*

“Penelope”, the final chapter of *Ulysses*, otherwise known as Molly’s soliloquy, is a direct example of the *phenotext/genotext thetic process* upon which Julia Kristeva heavily expounds in her study *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974).

In this chapter, though for Jungian scholar Kimball neither a chapter, nor episode, but rather “a coda ... whose function is to ‘countersign’” (112) it is more than evident how “Joyce developed to its highest point of refinement the experimentation with narrative point of view, interior monologue, and stream of consciousness” (Spinks 98). Molly goes from being confused

to affirming her love for Leopold Bloom, as well as establishing herself as a character who is complex and complete, although merely her thoughts are known.

Upon examination, the use of the verbal aspect of repetition, as well as a clear and intentional use of an imperfect means of expression, serve as phenotext in the imitated thoughts and self-reflections of a fictional character, half-waking in bed. Such are presented as jumbled and unformed but constant in their flow and meaning, which Spinks refers to as Molly's "corporeal responsiveness" (5). Given its nature of pure thought resulting in speech, this soliloquy may be better understood if Kristeva's concepts are to be employed as a basis upon which to comprehend them.

The soliloquy begins and ends with two single utterances of "yes", but neither is the same in meaning. The first, a reflection on an unusual request to have breakfast in bed, initiates a train of thought in which Molly examines the doubts she has had about her relationship with Leopold, her husband, before drifting off into thoughts about her extra-marital affair, as well as reflecting upon her own background. Whether it is a representation of an actual woman or not is debatable among critics. For the purposes of this study, let Philip Toynbee's opinion suffice, for matters of analysis concerning the authorial intention and not the actuality: "Within the limits of the judgment we are making we need not decide whether this is the female mind or not; it is, in any case, *the anima, the female image* in the mind of the male, sensual, intuitive, submarine" (Toynbee 282; emphasis added). In such manner of reminiscing on her situation, Molly is the anima and her "thoughts return repeatedly to the question of personal autonomy" (Spinks 125). However, the end concludes with Molly affirming, partially, that she is satisfied with her marriage (or may be interpreted as such), closing with positive thoughts of better times past without regret, despite "the slavishness of male desire ... there is certainly no shame in sexuality" (Spinks 126). Between these two points is a journey, imperfect, in which Molly lays out her progression of thoughts, which may be seen through or interpreted by the reader as the progression of self-reflection in the aim of responding to a question posited before her. In other words, Molly contemplates her existence, which compels the reader to keep on reading, and, hence, "Molly's sensibility adapts the stream-of-consciousness technique and suspends the grammatical structures of prose in order to convey the allusive associational logic of her dream thoughts" (Spinks 125). More to the point, the same allusiveness forms into a character who is total in their arc from outset to end.

Joyce noted in a letter to Frank Budgen that the soliloquy “begins and ends with the female word *Yes*. It turns like the huge *earth ball* slowly surely and evenly round and round spinning” (Gilbert 170; emphasis added). Albeit, Joyce draws upon other means, filling the chapter with allusions and metaphors (as found in *Ulysses*⁶⁵) to archetypes, the “yes” has a distinct feature of its own to hold the structure together through verbal punctuation and stress.

In concordance with Kristeva’s theories, this process in which conclusions are reached and the meandering way in which they are arrived at is crucial as to better understand the semiotic nature of Molly’s soliloquy. While the soliloquy may be read as a dialogue between Molly and herself, she shows the interest for others as well, directly posing a question “why dont they go and create something” (*U* 681), hinting at the fact that without her as the embodied anima and mother archetype, Bloom and Stephen are unable to create. The poetically free nature with which Joyce approaches the unbroken thoughts and debate Molly has with herself allows us to conclude that “the question goes to the heart of *Ulysses* and involves both protagonists [Stephen and Bloom]” (Kimball 116), but it is one of approaching and reuniting again with the mother, with creation, with intimating oneself with the shadow as bound to the anima.

The chapter opens with Molly angrily perplexed by her husband, Leopold Bloom, who has asked to be served breakfast in bed, a request he has not made for some time and which, when he does it now, greatly annoys her: “Yes because he never did a thing like that before as ask to get his breakfast in bed with a couple of eggs since the City Arms hotel” (*U* 640). The “yes” here in its genotext is meant to underscore this expressed perplexity of something new, as a marker of verbal discourse that reacts to a new subject being introduced. This version of “yes” would also correspond to the new nature of Bloom at this point in the text.

Yet, Molly’s thoughts do not stay upon the topic of her husband, but travel immediately to those of Mrs. Riordan, and later to those of her absent husband, segueing from Leopold’s intentions to impress her to the faults of Mrs. Riordan herself: “to make himself interesting for that old faggot Mrs Riordan” (*U* 640).

⁶⁵ Molly is herself, in the spirit of reflecting upon the *Odyssey*, Penelope, waiting for her husband to return. As Joseph Campbell has noted, she fits an archetype of the long awaited return of the wife for her husband, “Penelope herself, whose journey is ... endurance. Out in Nantucket, you see all those cottages with the widow’s walk up on the roof: when my husband comes back from the sea” (*Pathways to Bliss* 145-159). In a similar manner, it could be supposed that Molly’s reflections upon her life are also a story of her own endurance. Moreover, as Odysseus returns home to the waiting arms of Penelope, Bloom returns to those of Molly, after having wandered about Dublin for the day.

This swaying between a multitude of topics, characters, and thoughts continues unabated throughout the soliloquy. After immediately criticizing her husband, and condemning the awful prudishness of Mrs. Riordan, as well as her strict Catholicism and the underlying jealousy of Molly herself, she returns to thoughts of her husband Leopold and why she does indeed like something about him, even if only in relation to these minor transitory figures within the text: “[s]till I like that in him polite to old women like that and waiters and beggars too hes not proud out of nothing” (*U* 641).

Yet again, this thought pivots upon another criticism which brings Molly back into reproach or distance from Leopold, highlighting an ever present female distrust, even to the extent of suspecting hostesses – nurses, too, if he were to go to hospital:

[i]f ever he got anything really serious the matter with him its much better for them to go into a hospital where everything is clean ... yes and then wed have a hospital nurse next thing on the carpet have him staying there till they throw him out or a nun maybe like the smutty photo he has shes as much a nun. (*U* 641)

The “yes” used here marks again the overall idea of the signified distrust of her husband, as the “yes and then” denotes a departure of the first thought of the natural fact to an emphasized form a resultive mistrust of her husband’s sexual proclivities based upon that fact but denoting something known prior.

Here the conflict in Molly of “waiting” archetypically for her husband’s return or finding reconciliation within herself is evident as she swings from one rich verbal description to another. This wavering between criticism and acceptance (read: lovingness/affirmation) of Molly’s husband, Leopold, is the essence of the soliloquy. Molly “stumbles upon” new ideas and resonates older ones, in which new items are elicited to illustrate attitude, opinion, and, at times, even revelations, long held but suddenly uncovered. As one “thought” is expressed, it may give to another one ultimately related but still distant, yet never irrelevant. This stylistic manner of which Joyce undertakes to present the soliloquy is in harmony with the idea which Kristeva purports that only abstract or avant-garde writing such as this may express the *thetic* process through which *phenotext* and *genotext* form into the discourse of semio-analytics. The character of Molly is in a debate with herself in which she is trying to come to her own conclusions; or, for

lack of a better word, this is the underlying *genotext*. However, the thoughts or expressions which emerge are not clear by themselves but allude, or are symbolic of, another and must be read into and in correlation with one another as a whole. This is the *phenotext* of the text itself.

Having an understanding of the soliloquy from this vantage point allows the reader to better approach the text through a semiotic and symbolic interpretation of the signs utilized and their signification, providing a richer reading for the text to be read and compared to itself. To wit, a Kristevian reading of the *genotext* and *phenotext* reveals that beneath the text there is an archtext built from the *phenotext* used, from the totally disconnected images and remembrances which would only be formed later in linguistic channels through *genotext*. This is a result of permanent communication within the context provided. Therein, while the language of Joyce's Molly is meager in its syntactical sense, it is still definitely rich in the meaning it strives to express. Exceptionally melodic, expressive, and led by the desire and will of a speaking subject, it reveals much more than it says outright, much like the rest of the novel.

To further explore what Kristeva purports in her signifying theory reading the text, let the following passage of Molly's conclusion act as a more precise confirmation thereof.

The conclusion opens with images of Spain, specifically Andalusia, which are linked together and cast one following the other. Words here become interrelated and mutually dependent in a string of meaning as the qualitative and semiotic/metaphorical associations of one depends on that following, as much as that preceding. The order in which they are presented, though, is not random at all, but direct, following the idea, essence, or "sign" of them in a pattern so that they may be associated as a whole to be understood as one continuous flow.

O that awful deepdown torrent O and the sea the sea crimson sometimes like fire
and the glorious sunsets and the figtrees in the Alameda gardens Yes and all the
queer little streets and the pink and blue and yellow houses. (*U* 682)

For the opening, the object to be expressed is the setting, arousing a range of imagery that is one place of association. The "yes" here is overtly affirmative, as if to denote a pleasure found in sudden remembrance or the positive nature of the imagery cited. Note how Joyce chooses the word/simile "crimson like fire" to describe the sea, but then may add the words "the sunsets". No direct simile or reference is used to describe the reflection of the sunset into the sea, but it is an

understood sign without mention or disjunction. This juxtaposition implies a genotext understanding to the overarching image. In like manner, Joyce may then move on to describing Andalusia, commencing with gardens, progressing to streets, and colors as has already been signified. This is done to impart a visual description upon the reader without actually delving into a description proper, but laid out directly. The process functions and does not seem out of place as the *thetic* process gives rise to one overt idea (i.e., sign) which is in progress of its own ultimate accord (i.e., signification). The *genotext* of this opening is merely the description, as if in past remembrance, indirect and elusive, but clearly shown through multiple instances of *phenotext* as isolated references to “Andalusia” are cited.

As the soliloquy advances, the setting gives rise to the emulation of Molly: “[a]nd the rosegardens and the jessamine and geraniums and cactuses and Gibraltar as a girl where I was a Flower of the mountain yes when I put the rose in my hair like the Andalusian girls used” (*U* 682).

The signs and signification of the setting seamlessly give way to those involving character description, as the associative sign of flowers allows for that of an action involving one used by the character to match the semiotic association of “flower” as an object pertinent to the setting in its signification; thus transitioning into another sign/signification of character which will now become germane to Molly’s character. The “yes” used here is one then that can be read to mark a new thought that arises from the instigation of the first mention of flower to transform Molly into the same symbol.

Joyce intentionally writes Molly as to associate her symbolically with the flower. Joyce firstly is carrying over the archtext nature of the *Odyssey* as applied to *Ulysses*, aligning the symbolism found in “the magic flower, Moly, which Hermes gave to Ulysses to preserve him for Circe’s wiles” (Ellmann, *JJ* 551). The flower of the mountain that Molly is called is this same type of flower and perhaps from which Molly owns her namesake. Joyce is making another parallel here, where Molly is the same *Moly* which had guided Bloom throughout his journey. According to Ellmann, Joyce “had to find a naturalistic equivalent for Moly” (*JJ* 551) in the form of an actual flower to be assigned to the character. Joyce obviously settled on making Molly the flower, as, after consulting two of his friends on what the etymological meaning found in this word (flower – *Moly*) was, he announced his final interpretation to Budgen:

Moly is the gift of Hermes, god of public ways, and is the invisible influence (prayer, chance, agility, *presence of mind*, power of recuperation) which saves in case of accident . . . Hermes is the god of signposts: i.e. he is, especially for a traveller like Ulysses, the point at which roads parallel merge and roads contrary also. (Ellmann, *JJ* 552)

When taking into account Joyce's own understanding, it becomes evident why the flower symbology in Molly appears when she accepts Bloom's return and love, as well as why she is the flower; Molly had been one of the predominant guiding lights for Bloom throughout his own meandering day to come back home.

The text at this point therefore pivots to the signification of the character using the sign or understanding of "flower" to represent Molly, as opposed to "Andalusia". Henceforth, the *genotext* also adapts, from descriptions of "Andalusia", to imparting one particular event important to the character of "Molly in Andalusia". The *phenotext* also changes in concurrence, but still rests upon "flowers" as the point of transition, as the sign signifying both character and setting. As Molly notes how she wore flowers, she is also *the flower*, as is understood by the pet name implied "he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower" (*U* 682) while she and Bloom are engaged in apparently love-making, these "yeses" may be pure verbal markers of approval given the carnal enjoyment at hand. This transition is also mirrored by the line "how he kissed me under the Moorish wall and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again" (*U* 682) in which the character transposes herself into a recalled setting from her past, redrawing attention onto herself and her relationship with Leopold, returning again to the main *genotext* found throughout the chapter of loving Leopold or not.

As has been noted, according to Kristeva, *genotext* and *phenotext* must act mutually to result in an idea expressed. As a further demonstration of their interaction to create a whole throughout the chapter, note how the soliloquy repeats "yes" multiple times, but the conclusion does so in such a way that the frequency of the word crescendos (eleven in total, the last line alone possessing four).

"First I put my arms around him *yes* and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume *yes* and his heart was going like mad and *yes* I said *yes* I will *Yes*" (*U* 682, emphasis added).

Yes, though, does not merely represent “yes” as a confirmation. Instead, “yes” always acts as the verbal signification allowing for a new piece of imagery or statement to emerge (in between a conjunction and discourse marker). In other words, “yes” acts as a sign that signifies not only a confirmation in its base semiotic nature, but also as a verbal note, a vocalization of change that marks and maintains the cadence and rhythm of the text, giving it a life of its own, representing thought through character. Moreover, it is both the active expression of *genotext* and *phenotext* in their modality; the former as it symbolizes an acceptance, the latter as one means to representation of the acceptance.

This same concept of *yes* may also be found in the prelude⁶⁶ leading up to the more famous exact conclusion in which “yes” is used in like manner, but here triggers the association of many instances of *phenotext* stemming from descriptions of the day that Leopold proposed to Molly, referring to an overall *genotext* of why she may indeed love him, ultimately emerging as a final life-affirming confirmative “yes” to his marriage proposal, given as the final uses of “yes” within the chapter proper, as has been discussed above.

Taken individually, the many examples and references Molly expresses in this final chapter may be mistakenly seen as an altogether meaningless whole: a disjointed, rambling mess. Yet when established together, it may be clearly seen how they are the expressions, signs, of one thought leading to another, all trying to emerge into a final signification. Therein, the thetic process of *phenotext* and *genotext* in the process of thought creating an ephemeral meaning or signification through the multiple, though jointed, instances of signs can be found here in the form of utterances of speech becoming literature. Freed from the bounds of conformity or narrative standards, utilizing signs to signify an end, Joyce here allows the reader to interact with the stream of consciousness, from beginning to end, which is understood not to be the end itself, but the *jouissance* of the text and its interpretation as well.

Molly’s last lines are ones of resounding affirmation. Still, the fact that this affirmation is but memory may serve to undermine it. The fact that these thoughts emerge from her reminiscence seem to cast them in a melancholic shade instead of one of power and promise.

⁶⁶ “the day I got him to propose to me *yes* first I gave him the bit of seedcake out of my mouth and it was leapear like now *yes* 16 years ago my God after that long kiss I near lost my breath *yes* he said was a flower of the mountain *yes* so we are flowers all a womans body *yes* that was one true thing he said in his life and the sun shines for you today *yes* that was why I liked him because I saw he understood or felt what a woman is and I knew I could always get round him and I gave him all the pleasure I could leading him on till he asked me to say *yes* and I wouldnt answer first only looked out over the sea and the sky I was thinking of so many things” (*U* 681-2; emphasis added).

According to Fritz Shenn, “[M]emory transforms, distorts, select, embellishes. Above all, language itself is epimorphic, words do multiple duty and accrete meaning or become historical repositories” (255). The questions must be asked: are these thoughts in relation to the present, the past or both? Additionally, do these promises of happiness fall behind the haze due to the fact that they are happy memories? Can happiness be sustained through the power of memory alone? Jolanta Wawrzycka is of the opinion that “[P]roleptic marital memory accounts not only for what we know about the characters of Molly and Bloom, but also, through preserving and repeating elements of the past, for the possibility that the spouses’ marital bonds, cemented by their shared foibles, quirks, and traumas, *may survive*” (15). Regardless, while they may be memories, they serve for her affirmation to accept Bloom, especially in his new-found form. Moreover, the question may also be asked of Penelope, who is the most faithful character portrayed in that epic, but only has the memory of her husband to provide her sustenance until his return. Therein, Bloom as being transformed by the encounter/events of the day, has returned to the prior form of which he had been, to which Molly approves.

The inter-layering of signs, symbols, and archetypes used in *Ulysses* are actually what make it a resoundingly complicated text that is hard to manage without taking into account the representation of their underlying meaning as well as without a guide that annotates them. The problem of Joyce’s intent of association as the text should be read notwithstanding (as the signifying process may take that into account but need not consider it the final say in the text’s interpretation), the signified meaning of the text of *Ulysses* is not always readily accessible upon its reading, despite the application and wishes of Kristeva. Joyce himself had commented openly on the fact that *Ulysses* is an intentional hard read, as it was his resolve in the work to use such a variety of references and hidden meanings that it would be pondered over for many years to come: “I’ve put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant, and that’s the only way of insuring one’s immortality” (Ellmann, *JJ* 521). Joyce’s mischievous aims aside, the text’s interpretation is dependent upon its reading and not its riddles. Hence, Kristeva’s theories of the thetic phase prove to be of great use in its semiotic and symbolic modes of interpretation, as well as archetypal criticism. Examining both the phenotext and genotext of the work, particularly the “Penelope” chapter, allows the reader to partially circumvent Joyce’s traps and understand the text as presented through an

accepting of its signs and signification of them. One can now ask not merely “What does this work allude to?” but “How can we better understand the signs as they work together to an end?”

Now, like *Ulysses* itself, after addressing Molly Bloom’s soliloquy, there is little left to say. The most respective Jungian archetypes and Campbell’s path of a heroic monomyth are established throughout *Ulysses* as a means to create a heroic character worthy of an epic within modern times as the obstacles they encounter and virtues they imbibe manifest in similar manner due to the basis of the archetype and motifs on which they are established.

6. A Cyclic Retelling of the Tale: Archetypal Opposites in *Finnegans Wake*

6.1. “Ask yourself the answer, I’m not giving you a short question”⁶⁷

It would be wise for anyone working on James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* to be able to answer the question “Why?” closely followed by “What is it about?” It is best to posit this question upfront as it must be asked. As the crow flies, most asking the question are Joycean fellows who have dipped into the book, become intrigued as well, and, then, exasperated, give up at last in disgust. Needless to say, having set Campbell’s model of a heroic quest as a guide through the earlier sections of the dissertation, the stage when the hero pauses and decides to return comes on rapidly. Joyce switches his focus from the eternal path of the hero to the eternal structure of the archetypes within the narrative of *Ulysses* to focus on the eternal figures of Molly and Bloom. However, *Finnegans Wake* disposes of characters almost entirely to manifest them as pure forms of narrative archetype. Difficult as it is, it resulted from fully seventeen years of labor, emerging as Joyce’s last published work. It echoes the words of Joyce himself who proclaimed in *A Portrait* that such a work he was “to forge in the smithy of my [his] soul” (*P* 288). The underlying reason for grappling with such a peculiar and forbidding text lies in its complexity, which, despite its outright oddness, is rich in its ability to touch upon the reader, as this section shall seek to demonstrate.

The particular question as to why the book is worth the exceptional demands made upon its readers is a central issue. Why should one devote the enormous time it takes to read even fragments of such a perplexing work when the simple related question of “what is it about?” is not even itself a question that has a direct answer. Most recently, no less than the renowned literary author Michael Chabon (2012) went through the Joyce material that had been studied thus far with a deserved appreciation of how richly Joyce’s work, text after text, had illuminated his life. Commenting on this experience he noted, “[A]fter that I came up against the safety perimeter, beyond which there lurked, hulking, chimerical, gibbering to itself in an outlandish tongue, a frightening beast out of legend” (Chabon 2). Chabon here was referencing *Finnegans*

⁶⁷ *FW* 515.19-20

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

Wake before him. Comically, Joyce himself asked about such a journey through the text of *Finnegans Wake* asserting: “You is feeling like you was lost in the bush, boy?” (FW 112.3). This is definitely the case.

Much of the failure to grasp the meaning of the text can be blamed on a deficiency on the approach of the reader who would otherwise think that suitable concordances and summaries would remedy the situation by deconstructing Joyce word-by-word (as if it were purely Old Norse – a language Joyce could read but the reader may not), but would still be lost in doing so. If there were only a glossary, there is still no grammar or formal structure which identifies the sentences and the roles they play, so even at that the reading would still seem perplexing. It is not that approaches are lacking in sussing out the text, foremost among which is approaching it as a dream framework, which is highly prominent given the early support of Joyce who himself had by his bedside a notebook to record his dreams and quizzed his friends on their own dreams at the time of the novel’s writing (see Ellmann, *JJ* 84, 436, 601). From some of its earliest interpretations by Edmund Wilson on how Joyce’s last and most challenging work should be read as a dream state, a great deal has had to do with its dream framework as the basis for its criticism and analysis. The issue, however, with this stance, is that a dreamer is required to dream the dream. Wilson criticized in “The Dream of H.C. Earwicker” that the work had entirely perplexed him until its conclusion when its underlying structure was finally unveiled, as being constituted out of a dream by a drunken publican in Chapelizod (see 438-457). This particular key opens a variety of possibilities for an archetypal reading of a confabulating text around that particular axis as arising from the mind of HCE, as he is called in Joyce’s work, or so this dissertation writer may assert here to accord with this analytical approach.

Still, a close reading of a text, even at its most basic level, requires a structure in which the elements of the text (characterization, plot, symbolic framework) can be aligned with so that they may all work together to render the work meaningful and comprehensible. In this respect, Michael Chabon in his article “What to Make of *Finnegans Wake*?” goes through an experience that is not at all unusual, one in which Joyce’s last work both attracted him and exhausted him, despite the many guides he had consulted that sought to explain the work by tracing individual references. Chabon’s son at last asked the question that he had failed to answer and which this dissertation writer was often asked: “What’s it about?” (6).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

Unable to answer after so many years, Chabon banished the work forever from further consideration, implicitly suggesting that the sophisticated audience of the *New York Review of Books* (for which he was writing) do the same. He based his conclusion on the very indistinctiveness of the dream life in *Finnegans Wake* leading to “murky waters” (11) and “grand futility” (11) which was in essence a failure of form: “The *Wake*’s failure to render up a true account of the experience of dreaming, of the unconscious passage of a human consciousness across an ordinary night, was only a figure for a greater failure, a more fundamental impossibility” (11), Chabon therein writes of the incoherence of a text seemingly going nowhere, at least when read in a linear fashion and not in a serial manner as this dissertation’s reading proposes.

The outright truth is that any reader should be frustrated by Joyce’s bewildering text, despite any supposed guide that proffers coherence. In the end, the reader cannot help have a vision of Joyce being seventeen years in a tiny apartment in Paris with his wife Nora beside him, evidently giggling wildly at his writing, waking Nora repeatedly (see Hutchins 186). The so called “little magazines”, especially Eugene and Mary Jolas *transition* that carried much of his work also had segments from equally difficult T.S Eliot and Ezra Pound, long poems unfolding in serial publication over a protracted time attracting devotees along the way, including the young scholars who insisted that the works are perfectly comprehensible. This only need be mentioned as it would appear that writing in postwar Europe lent itself to extreme complexity as to escape the forms established hitherto the ante-bellum world.⁶⁸ It goes without saying then that a reader, especially a Joycean scholar in that regard, should be able to answer the question Chabon’s son poses. While stupid questions have stupid answers, equally complex ones have perhaps complex answers as well; In brief, the challenge of the novel’s value may be answered as such, though it may take the breadth of this section to answer.

Chabon aside, a great deal of credit is owed to Rabaté for opening the possibility of actually approaching *Finnegans Wake* and leaving with a smidge of appreciation for it, as opposed to sheer bewilderment. In his “Joyce and Jolas: Late Modernism and Early” (1998-1999), he offers an entirely novel perspective on how Joyce’s most difficult work may be

⁶⁸ The novel in this regard, as Kimball has reflected on it, is of its time: “Whether as a continuation of the autobiographical fiction or as a gloss on its earlier stages, the *Wake* represents the last stage in a fictional voyage of self-discovery, self-definition, and self-revelation, a voyage that ... turned inward and engaged the world beyond consciousness” (135).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

approached. Rabaté rebuffs a traditional linear reading in which character development within the conventional narrative rises to a climax and descends into a satisfying resolution characteristic of a more naturalistic novel. He insists that such reading does overlook the key organizing device of *Finnegans Wake* which is the language utilized, liberated from a strictly linear structure of development, rendering the novel through a system of significations at the level of a universal language or discourse that Joyce invented (see Rabaté, “Joyce and Jolas” 245-252). Jolas also proposed the same in his manifesto “Revolution of the Word” (109-129), more specifically that Joyce was a myth-maker and the renovator of the debased language of the times through a language and personally devised mythology that was the universal “language of the night” (Jolas 418). Regardless of the mythic or circular approach suggested, Rabaté still sets out the foremost obstacle to reading the text which is that “in no other text are the indeterminacies of the speaking voice so dense and overwhelming that the reader has only a blurred impression that something is being told, though he cannot ascertain what or by whom” (*Narratology and the Subject of FW* 137). However, oddly enough, this assertion lends itself to a non-linear reading. If it is fully comprehended that the text is meant to be read as one whole which is divided into many parts that reflect and establish upon one another through their oppositions, it may be gathered that the lack of character, especially the character of one ego, is merely inherent to the nature of the text which is an unfolding but repetitive tale, as presented as a “myth of creation”.

Jolas terms this mythic structure of the narrative of *Finnegans Wake* as the “paramyth” (278) which is expressed in a universal “language of babel” (277). When the text is read as such, as a myth that repeats in cycles which is inherent to one origin and idea that it is trying to explain in a large circle, it is striking how very different *Finnegans Wake* actually looks. When read in *transition* in segmented form as approaching the novel as a series of pieces in a circular nature in which one part is almost equal to another (save for the beginning and conclusion), the aims of the “narrative” become far more clarified. Moreover, taken together as pieces contributing to a whole which need not be laid out in a motion of one time frame from an exact beginning to an end, the text is far more accessible. Therein, it is hoped that by setting out and examining *Finnegans Wake* which employs this style of what Eliot called “the mythic method” (268-271) a way may be found to read it within its own conventions.

6.1.1. *Eternal Repetition in Myth and History*

First and foremost, once the underlying serial format of a particular modernist tradition to which *Finnegans Wake* adheres is understood and accepted, a system may be found to conceive of a particular order that guides one's reading, though in a particularly non-linear manner. Instead, the overall structure of the text should be read as an emulation of itself repeating.

In *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce examined history in its cyclical nature and not its linear development. According to Burgess, Joyce used Vico's *La Scienza Nuova* (1725) as an inspiration for the cyclical nature portrayed in the novel, "in which he presented history not as a straight line but as a circular process of recurrences" (*A Shorter FW* 8). The New Science Viconian cycle of history is even mentioned in the text itself as "[O]ur wholemole millwheeling vicociclotometer" (*FW* 614.27), suggesting how the whole book is one big "[W]heel of Fortune" (*FW* 405.24) where everything "moves in vicous cicles yet renews the same" (*FW* 134.16-17), i.e., a "corso in cursu on coarser again" (*FW* 89.11). Naturally, this usage therefore deserves exploration to pinpoint the Joyce's theoretical and aesthetic musings.

Giambattista Vico is well known for his concept of a rise and fall throughout historical periods of humanity in which there are cyclical forms of resurrection and decline. However, this pattern of historiography came only secondary to the suppositions he made as an aesthetician that called out the essence of humanity as resulting in unique repeatable patterns for the human construct of poetics (i.e., aesthetic theory). In *The New Science*, while delving into such poetics, Vico firstly establishes that these are universal, stating that "[t]he human mind is naturally impelled to take delight in uniformity" (66). Upon this basis, he builds an argument that there is also a universal structure that follows within narrative forms. Vico notes, when discussing fables (which for him would represent legendary folklore or common stories of the time) that "[t]he habit the vulgar have when making up fables of men famous for this or that, in these or those circumstances, of making the fable fit the character and occasion" (66). Though this does seem roundabout, actually Vico implies that there is an underlying axiom determining storytelling in which the circumstance must follow a rule given the hero's general myth, much akin to the basic concept of Jung or Campbell. Although he is critical of this vulgar approach to the universality of poetics or refined art, the essence remains of universality in storytelling in which humanity

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

finds itself undergoing a process of repeated change within a rise and fall. Vico also noted the importance of the allegorical to all stories, indicating another form of universality to the symbolic, where “[t]he true poetic allegories . . . gave the fables univocal rather than analogous meanings for various particulars comprised under their poetic genera” (67). Given these axioms, it is evident that Vico created a universal basis for narrative storytelling that is firmly established upon an eternal axiom of the human mind, especially as attributed to imagination when confronting the venal world.

Much like the form of an archetype, the axiom manifests in a form that is first vulgar and then refined. However, Vico’s axiom lacks any guarantee that the shapes they conform to be related as one representing the other: consequently, one manifestation of the axiom is unto itself and not necessarily the same as another, as with Jung’s archetypes. Instead, Vico underscores the fact that a cyclic nature exists within the establishment of the human mind within society repeats an eternal cycle placed against its historic nature, wherein the story is doomed to repetition. Therein, while it does correlate to Jung and Campbell, it focuses more on the concept of an eternal myth that becomes repeated as history unfolds. Neither theory contradicts the other, but both claim support within their bases in differing areas. What is important is that Joyce used Vico as a source for focusing on an eternality of the human mind to manifest a story in its repetition. For Vico, it is the history of humankind from its origins; for Joyce, it is the repetition of the eternal form of the narrative that humankind tells itself to make sense of its origins. This is the root concept from which Joyce derives the underlying framework of the *Wake* in order to create the universal narrative divorced from the historic nature of the instance of its placement within history.

From a Jungian standpoint, the examination of the universal narrative is applicable in the same sense that Campbell notes all myths stem from: the collective unconscious. As opposed to Vico, Jung would claim stories arise from manifestations of the collective unconscious (the nature of the human mind as Vico would see it). However, the stories occur to accomplish a psychological quest for totality where the archetypes come together to relate the story of a particular instance against the eternal. For Joyce, the *Wake* naturally would have presented all these same respective archetypes that have been traced through Joyce’s more accessible works thus far. With an archetypal system supporting its stages from division, disunity, and pain to a joyful, or more precisely “joyceful”, examination of the collective unconscious and its repeated

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

manifestation of archetype within the narrative, *Finnegans Wake* is also examined as a totality of the psyche, as related to an eternal reoccurrence of the narrative.

This exact semblance begins in *Finnegans Wake* at the most constricted level of a pub and widens at last to embrace that “snotgreen sea” (5) of *Ulysses*, turned in the end to death as a loving father embracing his daughter, as has been noted repeatedly, the union of the anima and animus represents a union of the conscious and unconscious. In terms of the narrative, what was separated becomes one, which gives life to a new demarcation as it comes apart and the narrative repeats. Much as how ancient gods die and give birth to the land or humanity⁶⁹, Anna Livia Plurabelle, in the ultimate lines of *Finnegans Wake*, joins as the river Liffey with which she is identified reaching the sea at last. This same scene is returned to at the end, creating the beginning anew through the waters merging and diverging.

The implication of Vico as well as referencing only motif when writing the text in a mythic structure is that no linear time can be formed nor is it the intention of the narrative to set out its development in this manner. When asked about the incoherent structure of the narrative in *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce noted that “[T]here is not past, no future; everything flows in an eternal present,” (qtd. in Deming 22). In accordance with trying to present the work as being a narrative reflecting upon and recreating a cyclic reality, Samuel Becket proffers perhaps one of the best reasons as to why *Finnegans Wake* can and should be read. Beckett, well aware of the easy criticism, already fully comprehended the nature of the text as being circular and not representing a traditional form, commenting “[H]is [Joyce’s] writing is not about something; it is that something itself (14). The implication of Becket’s comment on Joyce is that Joyce is writing about something that is continual, not merely a segment of imagined space time.

The cyclic nature of the text as it is portraying a circular construct of storytelling and the emergence of the collective unconscious by the repetition of the story in its recurring forms is heavily suggested by the writing of the opening and beginning in which they must be read to merge into one another. When examining the last lines of: “A way a lone a last a loved along the” (*FW* 628.15-16), ending with “the”, it necessitates that there is more coming only due to the fact that “the” may not be alone in English. While it need not be linked to the first sentence of the novel’s opening, there must be more. Indeed, though some critics may agree that it would be

⁶⁹ As with Kingu who was slaughtered to make humanity by Enki in Babylonian mythology and Tiamat (goddess of the ocean waters) is created into the Earth. See, for instance, Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

false to assign it to the opening, when compared to it: “riverrun, past Eve and Adam’s, from swerve of shore to bend of bay, brings us by a commodious vicus of recirculation back to Howth Castle and Environs” (*FW* 3.1-3), one can see that “the” is needed as the definite article is needed when addressing all rivers in English as in reference to local topology. Yet, this again need not be the case. What should be recognized is that this study of a collective unconscious initiates with the second half of a sentence and ends with the first half of that same sentence, symbolizing a flowing circle – the infinite nature of the stories which arise in the construct of history, always referring back to the same, primal source.

The structure of the novel in this regard suggests that the story is constructed as a *myth of eternal return*. As opposed to a linear framework of time, since the perspective is that of dreaming within the text, *Finnegans Wake* is a trip which has no beginning or ending, but flows into one another since the events recur endlessly emulating their origins. Where does such a construct take the reader then? Into the collective unconscious which reshapes itself from the original occurrence: into the mind (in archetypal terms: into the darkness and night sea journey) of humankind. This concept is echoed by Mircea Eliade, who argued that “in imitating the exemplary acts of a god or of a mythical hero, or simply by recounting their adventures, the man of an archaic society detaches himself from profane time and magically re-enters the Great Time, the sacred time” (Eliade and Frye, *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries* 23). Albeit that Eliade was putting forward a concept of time demarcated between archaic thought and modern thought, his argument is relevant to the analysis of *Finnegans Wake*. For Eliade, the structure of all existence for the archaic man is based upon an original instance of creation and legend (the latter akin to Vico’s concept of the legendary hero), where the archaic man must return to and recreate his or her own existence. In this sense, Joyce builds his *Finnegans Wake* as a story which returns to a primary construct of one story reiterating itself as being a re-emulation of the original sacred story, whose manifestation as a narrative is but the recreation of the ultimate narrative. For this very reason, *Finnegans Wake* lacks a linear plot and instead aims to recreate the concept of the eternal myth which simply reoccurs.

In supporting the narrative structure as such, Joyce employs varied tales, almost skits, in which mythic constructs, primitive rites, religious interpretation of the journey towards death, and legendary figures coincide. Echoing the rich storehouse of symbolism that Jung had identified and analyzed across cultures, considering what was found as active agents in human

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

consciousness, in aiming to write a universal structure of a dream myth, Joyce takes on the deepest elements of the collective unconscious into his work. However, he does so in narrative terms as to establish the basis of an eternal mythic structure, much as the myth of the eternal return of Eliade establishes the meaning of recreating the legendary story in order to make sense of history. As Jung notes in approaching the mythology of the past for its relevance to the present, “[a]ll those factors [archetypes], therefore, which were essential to our near and remote ancestors will also be essential to us, since they are embedded in the inherited organic system” (371-2; vol. 8). Therefore, the *Wake* could be considered the ultimate representation of archetypes since it delves into recreating a form of eternal myth by placing it into a realm of pure archetype and the collective unconscious.

In evidence of this seemingly broad statement, an examination of the *Wake* shall show it to be the case that is structured as a cyclical myth that embodies archetypal forms as “myth”.

To illustrate, as they are relegated to a form that may morph freely from one archetype to another, the characters may well take over or represent another or all at any given instance but only may do so when they unite into one as two opposites forming into a new identity or when one character shares in the symbolism of another. For this very reason, the characters who do people *Finnegans Wake* are fully awake, purposeful, and active, but seem to have no substantiality, being only “the charictures in the drame” (*FW* 302.32). Spinks asserts the same in his own analysis, stating that every character makes up an assemblage of a greater part: “In Joyce’s allegorical and analogical schema every character is both individually distinct and an aspect of a larger totality” (Spinks 129). In line with this idea, the very language of the novel comes across as more dreamlike in which characters appear, reappear, and disappear, blending into each other both as the opposites and in their resolution as male/female (*anima/animus*), patriarchy/matriarchy, and as sibling rivalry are related; or as James Joyce expresses it: “[e]quals of opposites, evolved by a onesame power of nature or of spirit, *iste*, as the sole condition and means of its himundher manifestation and polarised for reunion by the symphysis of their antipathies” (*FW* 92.8-11).

It would seem that Joyce challenged himself by trying to create a novel which could not exist by absolving it of the function of linear plot and distinct characters. Joyce would seemingly be trying to write about discordant functions that all interconnect to make up a concept of a reality presented within the novel itself. In much the same way as uniting the disparate sections

of the Jungian self which are inherent yet separate to one another, so does the novel. According to Kimball, as the linear concept of time and character within *Finnegans Wake* dissolves, “the fiction attempts to make the whole of the unconscious conscious, to absorb the Self into the Ego” (131), or, as Joyce mockingly puts it: “the labyrinth of their samilikes and the alteregoases of their pseudoselves” (*FW* 576. 32-3). Kimball goes on to say that the novel is “the assimilation of unconscious contents, a situation in which the Ego becomes ‘dissolved in identification with the self’” (131). This lends support to the assertion that Joyce was recreating a cyclical concept of history or mythology in which every character is one element that the reader may identify with as a universal whole.

6.1.2. The Prime Archetypes: Coniunctio and Coincidentia Oppositorum

Subsequent to documenting the experiences of an ordinary man at the level of the conscious in *Ulysses*, which was conducted on the border between the conscious and subconscious, providing moments when the subconscious triumphed over the conscious through powerful epiphanies, *Finnegans Wake* tries to recreate an existence in a somnolent state. Spinks is of the opinion, especially considering the crescendo of subconscious thought brought to the surface by Molly as she lies awake in bed within the closure of *Ulysses* that

[H]aving completed his epic of modern civic life by exploring the subconscious desires and dream-thoughts of a Dublin housewife, Joyce undertakes ... to parody and rewrite a number of Western cultural archetypes in the language of a drunken and dreaming Dublin publican. (Spinks 128)

Instead of the direct logic that is associated with waking consciousness and the logical input and output of language, Joyce chooses to make a novel as if it were a dream state. Perhaps the object of the endeavour was to create a liminal reality in which the actual historic and everyday was reflected within a mythic state for the latter to give substance to the former as if life were a projection of the mythic state. Jung himself opined that, “[D]reams are ... compensations for the conscious attitudes” (*MDR* 155); if it is the case that the dream can allow for consciousness to be

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

subsided to see the whole self, why cannot Joyce write a mythic parallel to create a story of the waking unconsciousness of reality? Jung finds no fault in art imitating the indefinite permutations of the psyche, even insisting that “[A] great work of art is like a dream: for all its apparent obviousness it does not explain itself and is always ambiguous” (104; vol. 15). *Not explaining itself* and *ambiguous* are two principles that the *Wake* holds itself to. However, perhaps when examined as if it were a retelling of the total self in mythic or dream state, its muddiness would become clearer.

The only issue is that, as it stands, applying outside framework such as dream analysis or theory as according to Jung or any other philosopher, does not mesh well as the goal of dream theory and its analysis is examining purely the psyche and Joyce’s *Wake* is a literary work that aims to be original by removing itself from traditional standards of narrative structure. Therefore, the novel defies interpretation when even an outside skeleton may be added to it as it cannot be classified as such. It is here only suggested that applying archetypal criticism to it will simplify its illumination, not that it be interpreted as a dream *per se*. Therein, the faulty assumption in interpretation that frequently arises is that it is a dream only, perhaps taking place in the sleep of Finnegan who disappears after the first few pages or simply the common world of dreams of everyman who turns into others as “Here Comes Everybody” or HCE. Merely stating that every character is equivocal to another or that Finnegan dreams the matter, solves nothing of the complexity of the work. It is merely a fun factoid that can be used as if one understands but has not truly examined the novel.

Notwithstanding, the backdrop of a dream is apparent from the outset and cannot be disregarded. When Finnegan strikes his head and is thought to have died, it initiates the actual events of the novel (as opposed to the direct “riverrun” which is used to introduce place and setting), as he is encouraged to go back to sleep. Clearly, *dreaming* is a watchword for the novel but it is not a dream. Instead, it should be examined along its symbolic and archetypal lines for how the novel is portrayed, by which dreams give an immediate insight into its use of archetypes. According to Jung there are two levels of dreaming, one *personal* and one *collective*, which function, distinctly different from one another: “[T]he personal unconscious contains sense-perceptions that were not strong enough to reach consciousness, and contents that are not yet ripe for consciousness” (66; vol. 7). While the personal unconscious manifests itself in dreams, it does so in a personal nature, relating to the aspects of the individual psyche. Yet, the

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

dreams also elicit the transpersonal nature of the archetype where the collective unconscious rises to the surface of the self, where the universal form of archetypes are seen that occur in all individual psyches, “because it is detached from anything personal and is common to all men . . . its contents can be found everywhere, which is naturally not the case with the personal contents” (Jung 66; vol. 7). Distinguishing between the personal layer and the collective unconscious layer of dreams is the main context to be applied to *Finnegans Wake* where it is the archetypes that are universally shared that are the subject and not the individual occurrence of them. The archetypes themselves play a role as character, which weakens the overall linear structure, and create a cyclic nature of the text. Employing the interpretation of dream theory therein is only suitable to this extent.

Dreams when put to paper in this sense are understood as a stream-of-consciousness technique in the service of taking on the abstract form of the character in an allegorical sense. In opposition to *Ulysses* where the dream is but narrative symbols, *Finnegans Wake* removes the essence of the character and surrenders to the symbolic, where archetypes take over in a decentered text. Therein lies the issue of *Finnegans Wake* as it is to be read: while the conventional approach bypasses the all-important question of form which would determine how the literary elements (plot, symbolization, characterization, style and theme) work together to establish a meaningful whole as novels had traditionally done, at least until the advent of Modernism with its characteristic defiance of traditional styles and structuring principles, the dream rejects the permanence of all classical forms of narratives by not having singularly substantiated characters and progressive plot structures.

An apt criticism for the *Wake* is that the characters are not fully developed, but rather have a fluid nature that can be reduced to initials, blend with each other and disappear into nature, becoming river, stone, tree, sky and earth – easily not being their own characters but as much part of the scenery. Margot Norris (1993) asserts that “something like characters and something like narratives do emerge from the reading of *Finnegans Wake*” (“*FW: The Critical Method*” 163). She also methodologically approaches the work by reducing all the characters to two endlessly metamorphosing into the most unlikely combinations in order to overcome this barrier. Norris even suggests that the novel be best understood in this manner so that the differing supposed voices “therefore represent different personae of the dreamer relating different versions of the same event” (“*FW: The Critical Method*” 170). The style in which Joyce uses this

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

multiplicity is actually novel, in the fact of naming two different characters as one, but is not novel in the sense of the character struggling with him or herself. Joyce, as Norris also states, takes this approach stylistically so that “he can express many conflicting feelings simultaneously” (“*FW: The Critical Method*” 170), which permits characters to be mere direct representations of one constant that emerges within instead of an antagonism from without.

The problem is that the explication of *Finnegans Wake* from its earliest supporters sought to explain the text in a linear fashion. Without that structuring device of a conventional linear narrative, however, it is ambitious indeed to discover and explain how the very baffling Kersse the tailor could be “some of Joyce’s finest writing” (McHugh, *Annotations to FW* xiii). The tale itself begins with 12 customers bringing in a radio/television richly described whose weather announcement concludes the episode. The tale involves a Norwegian captain who requires a suit. The ship’s mate at the pub suggests Kersse the tailor who accepts the commission. The captain comes back, pronounces the suit unsatisfactory and leaves. Kersse comes back and strongly insists that the captain is impossible to fit. It turns out that the captain is about to marry the tailor’s daughter. The radio/television comes back on and that was that (see *FW* 311-328). Clearly, what happens is made available, but the crucial issue of “why” is not so easily resolved, putting the entire exercise of *Finnegans Wake* yet again in doubt.

Attempting to read the *Wake* as a dream, as if it had at its core a conscious ego in the irreversible past-to-future course of life, avoids the linear analysis issue, since it allows the text to be approached from a wholly allegorical manner. Yet, if it is based in a dream state and if the narrative is so free it is practically incomprehensible, the question may be posited then of how to detect or delineate the text into comprehensible characters and plots. The answer lies within the text’s inherent usage of archetypal structures, where the opposite is used against itself to create a duad that can be understood as a thesis and antithesis creating a synthesis of substantive interpretation. This would be in line with Tindall, who states, “Joyce saw domestic reality as the contention of equal and opposite rivals” (*Guide to James Joyce* 122).⁷⁰ Therefore the great

⁷⁰ Begnal in “*Dreamscheme: Narrative and Voice in Finnegans Wake* (1988) also seeks to employ the dream framework, insisting that the conventional genre of a family saga is supported by the narrative voice and character development as is normally understood. According to him, “a grand design” (12) is in fact present and can be read in the work, but only in a highly veiled form as a “narrative trail” (12). Consisting of linguistic techniques working as disembodied voices, the text is independent as a dream in which may be found a minimal coherence, namely “aspects of narrative technique and threads of narrative itself” (Begnal 12) out of which may be constituted “some sort of plot” (Begnal12).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

archetypal duad stands as the building block of analyzing and criticizing the work. This need not be the case only with *Finnegans Wake*, but also with Joyce's other works. Particularly illuminating is *Exiles*, where this oppositional concept is evident in the relationship between Richard Rowan (the main protagonist of the play, whose intellectual dilemmas as to whether he should settle down in Ireland as a lecturer or flee the nest as Joyce himself did) and his male counterpart Robert Hand (Richard's close friend) balance off one another to create the tension of the play. The same oppositional pairing as a duad is apparent in the *Wake* for the relationship of the twin brothers Shem and Shaun. Tindall suggests this to be the case: "The rivalry of Richard and Robert, the first a Shem, the second a Shaun in their present relationship, finds a place in this developing pattern" (*Guide to James Joyce* 122).⁷¹

Moreover, apart from oppositional duads, archetypes may be found when expressed in their associated multiplicity, namely when the character by name may be placed into an association of another mythological construct that pertains to the same archetype. H. C. Earwicker also known as "Haveth Childers Everywhere" (*FW* 535.34-35) or else just "HCE" is the publican we meet early in the text (see *FW* 32.18-19). Besides his immediate form by name to replace the old Finnegan, "he also becomes an archetype of Adam, Christ, Caesar, Wellington, Cromwell, the legendary Irish hero Finn MacCool and a plethora of other identities" (Spinks 129). Named after an earwig-catching device that he carries, even related to "Humpty Dumpty" who could not be put back together despite all the king's horses and men coming to do so, HCE hosts the guests who tell separate tales such as "How Buckley Shot the Russian General" (see *FW* 338-54), a tale told by Butt of an incident during the battle of Sebastopol when he did not have the heart to shoot a Russian general in the act of defecating. This leads to other tales within tales as the most varied cast of characters, sometimes with astonishing names and almost always in pairs (Shem and Shaun, Tuff and Butt, Justius and Studiosus). They are not fully formed characters but archetypes with shifting and unstable identities that set out a dispute and resolve it

⁷¹ *Exiles* is an important social commentary that delves into criticism of the time, particularly concerning the Irish Diaspora who spotted the world from the latter half of the 19th century until after the First World War. However, its framing of narrative is as much the rivalry of two friends (brothers, compatriots) as may be found within *Finnegans Wake*. In fact, the duality of *coniunctio* is the entire plot device of the play itself, which is why this dissertation has favored examining *Finnegans Wake* and using *Exiles* as supporting argumentation. Albeit, the play itself deserves more attention in literary criticism, especially as an examination of Joyce's attitudes to the theatre, it is not the place here as it functions itself as but a mere short narrative compared to the giants found elsewhere in Joyce's oeuvre.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

to restore harmony, most frequently by the merging of identities that only exist when going in and out of opposition to one another.

Ultimately, it is a novel put together through its archetypal segments and is strongly recommended that the reading not be linear but rather cyclical in its associations.⁷² The text follows a nuclear family, at its core: HCE and ALP as they are mostly known, and their twin sons Shem and Shaun as well as their daughter Issy. There are, to be sure, varied stories that will be generally bracketed and set aside, as they were originally published separately as the *Tales of Shem and Shaun*. Yet this does not detract from their shared duadic/oppositional nature. God's quarrel with Satan in the Mick and Nick episode, for instance, or the debate between St. Patrick and the Archdruid at the culmination, has little to do with the central and ever returning family of the Earwicker clan but much to do with a constant conflict between two antipodes, resulting in a discourse of meaning between the two.

The organizing principal of *Finnegans Wake* is therefore a loosely based archetypal criticism, where “[A]lmost any of Jung’s numerous descriptions of psychic inflation may also be used to describe character” (Kimball 132) in the novel. It is obvious for this reason that these delineations of text to archetype be carefully processed to not be easily or hastily confabulated. Equally important is not to overestimate the value of such criticism, as others still stand. Thurston comments that merely approaching the text as a manifestation of collective unconscious archetypes is not the singular view and that “the limited perspective of the ego into some liberating engagement with the collective unconscious. We might ... consider this a rather rosetinted view of a text” (418).

In order to overcome the lack of traditional narrative structure as well as to not overextend the archetypal criticism into multiple generally applicable instances, and since the entire book is far too encompassing to address every single issuance of archetype as it relates to the collective unconscious, the most representative parts of the text are here to be examined through the particular archetypal images of “the coniunctio” or the joining the opposites as Jung

⁷² Such is the opinion of many literati. Albeit *Finnegans Wake* is divided into four books consisting of seventeen chapters, Professor Sebastien D.G. Knowles, for instance, in his article “Finnegans Wake for Dummies” developed a reading plan inspired by Constantin Brancusi’s “Symbol of Joyce”. Knowles realized that the best way to read the *Wake* is to start in the middle and work the way out. Therefore, he suggested “three-round” reading plan (see Knowles 97-111). This reading plan elucidates the *in medias res* ability to take the chapters or sections serially at random owing to the fact that the reading of it is cyclical and repetitive, it need not start or end anywhere.

articulated in his alchemical studies through the myth of “hieros gamos”; i.e., the uniting of male and female principles.

For Jung these archetypal figures of the *coniunctio* “are tendencies which pursue a definite but not yet recognizable goal and consequently can express themselves only in analogies” (468; vol. 14). As the *Wake* pursues a general repetitive framework of establishing dualities in a semi-narrative structure, it is therefore more appropriate to examine the text *via* their use as analogies towards one another and from one another. Jung notes that these “coniunctios” are established only on the mutual bases they share, either attracted or repulsed by one another, thereby creating a whole as one unit: “The factors which come together in the *coniunctio* are conceived as opposites, either confronting one another in enmity or attracting one another in love” (3; vol. 14). According to Jung “they form a dualism” (3; vol. 14) only to emerge as “[T]he synthesis of the elements” (7; vol. 14) which is achieved “by means of the circular movement in time (*circulatio, rota*)” (7; vol. 14). Given the structure of the *Wake*, it is therefore germane that this be duly applied in its analysis.

What is more, to build on the duality, is creating a third – three out of two. Working in close co-operation with Jung, Jacobi in her study, *The Psychology of C.G. Jung*, elucidates the Jungian archetype of *coincidentia oppositorum* or “transformation of the opposites into a third term, a higher synthesis” (135). This archetypal figure “is expressed by the so-called UNITING SYMBOL which represents the partial system of the psyche as *united* on a *superordinate*, higher place” (Jacobi, *The Psychology* 135). Commensurate to the synthesizing of thesis and anti-thesis into a synthesis, the duad of characters in the *Wake* also are established into a third that emerges out of the two. Jacobi further states that “[A]ll the symbols and archetypal figures in which the process is embodied are vehicles of the *transcendent function*, that is, of the union of the different pairs of psychic opposites in a synthesis which transcends them both” (*The Psychology* 135). When a duality in the *Wake* is converged into a third transfiguration, this is the foundation of appealing to the eternal concept of repetitive myth, particularly that of creation. This is to be covered henceforth, as concerns ALP’s transformation into a sea goddess figure, otherwise a mother goddess figure, occurs only when the dualities have subsumed to her as a mother, a wife, a widow (see Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14), and all women as opposed to the male, animus construct that is absorbed into her. This may be evidenced by the “Some say she had *three* figures to fill and confined herself to a hundred eleven” (*FW* 201.28-29, emphasis added) used to

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

speak of ALP in the text. The character of ALP, and HCE for that matter, as well as Shem and Shaun, are all such a type of uniting archetypal figure that allow to “manifest itself in the most divergent forms, makes its appearance, the balance between the ego and the unconscious is restored” (Jacobi, *The Psychology* 135). Whether it is the “coniunctio” or “coincidentia oppositorum”, the manifestation of these archetypes can therefore be found throughout the text of *Finnegans Wake*.

A primary example of Jung’s “coniunctio” in practice is the case of twin brothers, only united as two halves of a complete man can they emerge as a whole. To illustrate further, the parents or, the male and female principle, is where one finds “coincidentia oppositorum”. These archetypal figures are of the mother and the father, the Jungian anima and animus. Opposed, they are dual. When united, they create a mythical genesis of the world. Only together can they become the ultimate creators of life and turn into symbols of eternal parents. To support the statement of a transcendent function of the “coincidentia oppositorum” archetype, ALP is therefore a mother and a daughter, but only with the father sea can keep circulation and producing new shapes and forms. This holy trinity is not apparent only in *Finnegans Wake* but throughout Joyce’s previous works as well. The emphasis on this uniting of two and of two creating three as a newly forged concept is evident in Joyce’s final piece of fiction, where it could be read that the text aims to present a psychic totality and re-establishment of the ego and the self-balance. The characters of the *Wake* are but a “[S]ymbol of this kind, representing a primordial image of psychic totality, always exhibit more or less abstract form” (Jacobi, *The Psychology* 135), which is also the corresponding reason as to why “their basic law and essence demand a symmetrical arrangement of the parts round a midpoint” (Jacobi, *The Psychology* 135). The midpoint of the dualities of characters as they form and merge into another is the “coniunctio” of the self. As the archetypal relationship of the characters has been outlined, the text now needs examining, or, to put it in the Wakean manner: “[L]et us leave theories there and return to here’s here” (*FW* 76.10).

6.2. Wakeswalks Expedition⁷³ in Eternity

Applying the concept of duads into a third of a “coincidencia oppositorum” involves firstly recognizing broader characters that fit their respective symbolic archetypes within the text as the “plot” unfolds then analyzing the meaning of the conjunction between the two opposites emerging as one united whole.

The flow of the river which opens the novel and which Liffey metamorphoses into is the first appearance of the anima figure that relates to the assigned name Anna Livia Plurabelle or ALP. She is named in part after the Liffey river flowing through Dublin, thereby merging with the setting and acting as a mother to the genesis of the place and time of where the story takes place (archetype of the mother as creator as representative in the mother goddess form). According to Burgess, “[T]he ‘Plurabelle’ indicates her beauty and plurality (she contains all women)” (*A Shorter FW* 14). As the name would suggest, she personifies all other *animae* within the narrative, meaning that all female characters or any nature that is feminine (anima) is ultimately related as a whole to ALP: “Isobel is contained in her, as is Kate the cleaning woman” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14). Moreover, since she embodies the nature of creation and birth, the setting is also of her. She is a progenitor of life, which is one reason why Joyce writes the path of the river in a triangular form: “[t]he roughly triangular configuration of a mountain turns her into a piece of eternal geometry – she is our ‘geometer’, or earth mother” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14). The triangular nature also implies the duality she corresponds to where she must unite with the opposite to reach her totality. Burgess also notes that “[A] triangle ALP suggests her triune form. She is wife, she is widow, but she is also daughter” (*A Shorter FW* 14), necessitating a correspondence to these relationships in order for her to exist as one.

As opposed to the anima, the animus is her consort embodied by HC Earwicker or HCE who blends at last into a landscape of Ireland through which the river passes as a master builder, presumably of Dublin. As much as ALP is every anima, HCE is every animus. “HCE plays man the father, and creator ... he creates city itself” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 13). HCE is the counterpart who unites with ALP and *vice versa*.

⁷³ *FW* 455.5-6

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

When these two opposites uniting as one are noted, the work can be read as pure mythology. Akin to a theogony for the modern world, it may be read as being related to a modernist epic to rival the cultural masterpieces of the ancient world but speaking of a failing civilization, where collapse and return are eminent events. It can be read as emulation of the creation myth and the end of times coming together. In this case, the archetypal structures alluding to mythical realities may be read in the same manner of the mythic theogonies of the past, where the creation and destruction of the world happens continually, and the active life of the gods reflects upon actual existence.⁷⁴ The text may also therefore be read serially as if each section could stand on its own, save for the symbolism of that joins the segments and the programmatic avant-garde reason for its creation. As one familiar with the stories inherent to a religious text or myth, the actors all come together as one entity of myth, playing their own parts in repetitive forms. In the words offered by Joyce: “[t]he worldroom beyond the roomwhorld” (*FW* 100.29). Eliade would term this the dreamtime, the “*alcheringa*” (*The Sacred and the Profane* 86), which is issued forth at the moment of creation from a central point. The creation itself at the outset shares more with the divine inspiration of its origins than later copies, whereby, in the dreamtime, “[t]he ‘first manifestation’ of a reality is equivalent to its *creation* by divine or semidivine beings” (Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* 85). The text of *Finnegans Wake* may not aim to be a myth of eternal return by which reality is based, but it certainly corresponds to and even emulates these features as a mythic creation of Dublin and the gods which suddenly spring from the land, becoming less divine and more human as the “myth” progresses by which a reader may find their own experience.

As related to the same concept of dreamtime eliciting the eternal reoccurrence of history, *Finnegans Wake* shifts between a world of night where the line delineating the unconscious and conscious is blurred. It creates a world in which the Jungian self may be represented as much as the myth is represented. The archetype of the self, as presented by Jung, is “a total, timeless man ... who stands for the mutual integration of conscious and unconscious” (31; vol. 16). The self

⁷⁴ The sentiment of HCE and ALP within the Dublin of *Finnegans Wake* as a mythic Eden of creation is easily comparable to the concept of establishing a mythic time by which the individual contrasts themselves to. As Eliade notes, when remarking on the nature of the mind based upon a cyclical myth, “[F]or just as the cosmogony is the archetype of all creation, cosmic time, which the cosmogony brings forth, is the paradigmatic model for all other times that is, for the times specifically belonging to the various categories of existing things” (Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* 76). In this same manner, as HCE and ALP are as liberated from historic time as possible, they act as mythic figures against which the reader can compare themselves as well in historic time.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

alone is not the archetype of *coincidencia oppositorum*, but its integral parts of ego against persona, conscious against unconscious, and animus against anima are all *coniunctio* that establishes the third identity of the self. The characters and setting of the *Wake* are easily structuralized into these forms of opposites creating a third. Therein, the symbolic nature of these characters as archetypes directly related to an imagining of the self are also apparent within the novel, such as the sexual nature of progeneration accompanied by the nullification of death that pose conjoining opposites to one another. These are also symbolized through the imagery of reference to day and night emerging from one another, when archetypal light is subsumed by darkness and *vice versa* as an eternal rise and fall of existence. Joyce brings out this opposition in a passage to distinguish between the darkness of night and the light of enlightenment at the first light of day:

Nuctumbulumbumus wanderwards the Nil. ... It was a long, very long, a dark, very dark, an allburt unend, scarce endurable, and we could add mostly quite various and somenwhat stumblemumbling night. Endee he sendee. Diu! The has gonig at gone, the is coming to come. Greetts to ghashern, hie to morgning. Dormidy, destady. Doom is the faste. Well down, good other. Now day, slow day, from delicate to divine, divases. (*FW* 598.5-11)

Reutilizing the river as symbol that ends in creation, here of the Nile but perhaps in wordplay to mean “nil” as in nothing, the darkness is long and drawn out, interrupted by the day. The darkness has become yesterday (“ghashern” – German) by the light of day (“diu”, by the day or interpretable as god from “Deus”). The imagery starkly contrasts relating to an instance of birth from death. Joyce paints in thick swathes, piling upon imagery and word play that conforms to one another as to attain a singular idea through repetition – hence the “Endee”, “gonig at gone”, and “Doom is the faste” which threefold scores the pure instance of the end. As had been seen in *Ulysses* where stream of consciousness lent itself to maximizing a run of thoughts alluding to a singular topic, here Joyce focuses on the genotext – resorting to the basic ideas and modes of expression directly related to the unconscious mind as to create the idea presented.

When he uses the Buddhist symbol of a lotus opening at dawn, Joyce also employs similar hints at a mythological framework lost in the modern world and recovered in “the

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

worldroom”, joining the mythology of the East and West into a single framework of reference: “[P]adma, brighter and sweetster, this flower that bells, it is our hour or risings. Tickle, tickle. Lotus spray” (FW 598.12-14), suggesting mythological constructs merging in the harmony of a world-myth where “that european end meets Ind” (FW 598.15-16). Here, the “Ind” suggests a reference to India, reminding one of the Hindu image of a lotus blossoming from the navel of Vishnu which creates (and recreates) the universe (see Campbell, *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words* 189-91). The “Lotus pray” as “let us pray” marks the observation of witnessing the coming and going of life with the day and night, where *Finnegans Wake* lasts through that “stumbletumbling night” (FW 598.8-9) until its ending at dawn.

Arising from this section is the outright analysis of Finnegan (or HCE) dreaming the existence of the “events” of the text, as the Lotus Flower alludes to Hindu mythology, where Vishnu dreams the world and has a lotus flower emerging from his navel (or, for that matter, Buddhist mythology where the lotus symbolizes nirvana with creation). However, this is but allusion and not evidence that Finnegan is a dreamer since it discludes facets pertinent to the dream creation of Vishnu. As he rides/rests atop a serpent who is an infinite loop, named Ananta, which means “endless” in Sanskrit, it implies that the dream creation of Vishnu is an *ouroboros*. Yet, Vishnu is not actually the one creating the existence; rather it is Brahma who Vishnu observes through the dream state. Hinduism does not consider that the world’s existence of now as being the singular event created but one of many instances which are countless and infinite in this regard. Moreover, the existence experienced in “reality” is but on repeated existence that reoccurs in its own manner, unique to itself but still one in the same.⁷⁵ When taking these facts into consideration, it can be noted that Finnegan is not dreaming the reality, so it is no actual dream, rather a tale of creation where the opposite of end and beginning unite as one. HCE is akin to Brahma, who creates the existence as perceived by Finnegan. Therefore, the *Wake* may be read as characters who embody instances of an existence as imagined, not merely dreamt, and these are same figures who are doomed to occur repeatedly until the end of time. Joyce goes so far as to even state this within the text: “[a]ll these events they are probably as like those which may have taken place as any others which never took person at all are ever likely to be” (FW 110.19-21). As such, this assertion is reminiscent of Eliade’s argument that worlds are created

⁷⁵ For more on Hinduism and its concepts of the dream creation, see Campbell, “Buddhist India” in *The Masks of God*. pp. 241-313; vol. 2.

almost as a ripple effect from a divine source, where the existence is merely the representation of the divine and not the divine itself (see *Cosmos and History* 12). Campbell also echoes the same sentiment, stating that “[T]he myth of eternal return ...displays an order of fixed forms that appear and reappear trough all time” (*The Masks of God* 3; vol. 2). Finnegan, when reading it from this viewpoint, could just be the godlike creature who dreams the existence into being while the other characters are the figures or forms in his dream that reoccur in every existence mimicking themselves to the divine source.

From the origin of the divine dream-creation, the archetype of *coincidencia oppositorum* first occurs, where there is a split in creation, matching the archetype where two are made from one, but merge back into one. Therein, the *coniunctio* divides the respective dualities further where one of male/female, light/darkness, etc. are deformed into many, but all are of the same archetype and origin as uniform body. Joyce again confirms a suspicion as such when all characters mirror one another as characters within characters that fit into a uniform whole. This assertion is highlighted by Joyce’s: “[t]he traits featuring the *chiaroscuro* coalesce, their contrarities eliminated, in one stable somebody” (*FW* 107.29-30).

6.2.1. Archetypal Sibling Rivalry: Brotherly Love, Brotherly Hate

As to better illustrate, by turning to *Finnegans Wake* it is readily seen that HCE and ALP are the first two fitting the archetype of *coincidencia oppositorum*, as has been hereto discussed. Yet their twin sons are the primary *coniunctio*. The triad of male characters assembles together back into HCE and again into an eternal one through his combination with ALP. Nonetheless, the characters of Shaun and Shem (two of their names) differentiate as being polar opposites, or are at least accorded an association as being two ends of a spectrum whose animosity generates them as one singular character. Shaun is the “angelic son”, HCE’s favorite, and the one who is supposed to deliver ALP’s letter on the topic of the sin in Phoenix Park – “foenix culprit” (*FW* 23.16). He is the Postman, the one who will ultimately transform himself as united with his brother Shem, in the dark of the room, where they are almost unrecognizable, into Kevin. He will then be referenced as the son of Mr. and Mrs. Porter, who will appear to replace HCE and ALP respectively with the morning.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

In contrast to Shaun, comes his *coniunctio*, Shem, who is a hustler, a fake, a parody on the word “sham”. Unlike his upright brother, Shem is a masturbator, that is, has suffered “the Tossmania” for the poor lad had “grillies in his head”⁷⁶ (*FW* 417.29-30). Joyce again relies on his repeated symbolic listing to enumerate Shem’s likeness as being wholly devil-like:

[a]n adze of a skull, an eight of a larkseye, the whoel of a nose, one numb arm up a sleeve, fortytwo hairs off his uncrown, eighteen to his mock lip, a trio of barbels from his megageg chin (sowman’s son), the wrong shoulder higher than the right, all ears. (*FW* 169.11-15)

Shem is the bane which Shaun cannot live with or without. As Shaun’s more significant role is the Postman, he would have no letter to deliver without Shem, the Penman, who writes it in an ink made of feces mixed with urine. Shaun is harassed by Shem “who taunts him and is jealous of him” (Benstock, *Joyce Again’s Wake* 217). In the struggles between both, one character is created as two sides of one coin.

Shem and Shaun are written as *coniunctio* to be one character, to symbolize not only the antagonism of individual *versus* individual, but of individual *versus* the self. They are “the dual aspects of man’s nature” (Benstock, *Joyce Again’s Wake* 108), representing the archetypal motif of warring brothers found throughout literature and mythology (Cain vs. Abel, Romulus vs. Remus, Osiris vs. Set, Enkidu vs. Gilgamesh, etc.). Burgess even rightly claims that they are “an eternal archetype in the war between Lucifer and Michael the Archangel (“Mick versus Nick”)” (*A Shorter FW* 15), which itself is a *coniunctio* of the brother *versus* brother archetype as Lucifer and the Archangel Michael are in their own sense and tradition brothers from the same creator. They are presented as two parts of a whole character within the twofold structure of their presentation.⁷⁷ They symbolize the motif of the struggle of the self when choosing between the stark extremes of the moral and immoral, between the ethical and unethical, between the beautiful and the ugly, the honorable and dishonorable, and so on. Yet this struggle only exists as

⁷⁶ A phrase here akin to a “bee in his bonnet” – angry with something to prove.

⁷⁷ For a similar usage of two individual characters acting as one whole in literature, see, for instance, Poe’s “William Williamson” where one character confesses a history of contention against another who has a similar name but is suggested to be the same character throughout the story.

its own form of character when two are in conjunction as opposing forces. They both must exist in order for a motif to exist.

This example of successive and simultaneous duality can again find its autobiographical synchronicity in Joyce's life where, according to Benstock, Shem the Penman is "Joyce's self-portrait and self-caricature, a continuation of the Dedalus figure and a burlesque of him, the artist as seen by the author and as viewed by the world at large" (*Joyce Again's Wake* 216). The brothers echo the relationship of the two brothers of the Joyce family: James and Stanislaus. This is especially read through the story of "The Ondt and Gracehoper" (bk. III.1), a rewriting of Aesop fable, in *Finnegans Wake*, the former being Stanislaus, who always provided financial support for the older brother (see Benstock, *Joyce Again's Wake* 217). Here, Joyce could be rewriting the counterposition between him and his brother, admitting that he had been more of Shem the nogoodnik than Shaun the loyal and providing son and brother.

Shem and Shaun themselves are associated with the symbolical archetypal images of tree and stone within the text: "[m]ay the treeth we tale of live in stoney" (*FW* 44.9). Biederman assigns the usage of trees as relating to being a symbol of "the earth but with their branches pointing to the heavens, trees are, like humans themselves, creatures of two worlds, intermediaries between above and below" (350), implying that trees symbolically are torn between the historicity of existence and the relation to a timeless sacred eternity. Such symbolism may be found accordingly within "The Mookse and Griper" episode of Book I.6, in which Shem and Shaun become "an only elmtree and but a stone" (*FW* 159.4). Here it may be interpreted that the tree is part of the duality of Shem and Shaun, referencing their creation from a divine source of which they also represent: HCE. In contrast is stone, which "[W]ith its characteristic durability and permanence ... is for many cultures a symbol of divine power" (Biederman 326), and in several myths "supernatural beings and even humans are made from stones" (Biederman 326). The stone therefore bespeaks the grounded natural distance from the divine in the eternal myth. While Finnegan may be creating the existence as the primary source of being, HCE is the interpreter and each step away from him is more corrupting to the Earthly than the last, hence Shaun and Shem being rooted in the Earth of stone but also embodying the tree. While the tree is rooted within stone and is doomed to become dust in it, both tree and stone are symbols of the creation of ALP and HCE as an aspect of them, being their children, their

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

sons, if the text is to be read according to an archetypal analysis based on symbols relating to mythic usage.

Following this interpretation, Shem and Shaun are extensions of HCE proper. They are two *animi* that accord with the father. As within mythology when a demigod is born of a god, possessing only some of the minor qualities, “[T]he tragedy of HCE’s two sons lies in the fact that each on his own is only half the man his father was: neither is fit to supersede the father in the task of ruling the community” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14). Shem and Shaun are therefore not only the *coniunctio* of one another, but are split in their forms as one character which embodies another, HCE, which is read as a *coincidencia oppositorum*, a third arising from the two. If *Finnegans Wake* is read in this manner, the confusion is abated somewhat since now a plot does not come to light but a continual re-emergence of characters and motifs as one in their totality. Given the nature of the text as it has been unravelled already, it is safe to assume that Joyce could not have meant these characters to be distinct from one another. Instead he was reaching beyond the limitations of standard literature to create characters that are one and many in symbolic form at one time. Benstock asserts that “Joyce is singularly aware that any sort of even division of all attributes to one type of man ... is decidedly unreal” (*Joyce Again’s Wake* 222). Unreal it must be since, for lack of a plot, the characters can neither be distinct nor have a respective arc. Instead, they act as singular beings that are split off from one total character (which may be read as an archetype of a self as referenced in Jungian theory). The characters created function only within the role of motifs that are the standard bearer of the “story”, where the narrative delves into the individual vs. the self, the individual vs. the mind, the individual vs. its opposite. Following this interpretation, it is far more evident that Joyce’s “purpose is to present these ... [characters] as two-dimensional facets of the nature of the single hero, of his Earwickerian Everyman who embodies both Shem and Shaun” (Benstock, *Joyce Again’s Wake* 222).

Sibling rivalry therefore need not be read as such – the brothers need not exist. However, the opposition of “the brothers” to one another where one contradicts the other must in order to denote a struggle of opposite forces embodied by two non-distinct personalities, but only denoting a division within the self of HCE.

The concept of a main character splitting into two coherent parts can further explain why the boys are unable to overtake their father’s role alone. As both are needed as one to create the

father again, no single one equals the father. Burgess notes as such, observing “their fights are really a vain attempt to become synthetised into a whole capable of bearing the burden of government” (*A Shorter FW* 14). In this regard, they are also unable to unite to overthrow him due to the fact they serve to function as a motif that demonstrates a clash within the character of HCE that is unable to be reconciled.

The discordant harmony between Shaun and Shem resonates when the Flora girls turn up to celebrate Shaun as he relates a tale of the “Gracehoper” (*FW* 414.21) otherwise Shem. Much as in *Dubliners*, Shem is assigned a quality of falling from grace but, by some means, always finding a way back into and out of it – hence the play on words of “gracehoper” in line with the dalliance of the fable of “The Ant and the Grasshopper”. His “little sisters and brothers” urge Shaun, the ironic upright and hardworking “Ondt” (*FW* 414.20). The tale deserves inspection since the word used for Shaun (“Ondt”) is Danish for “pain”. Therefore the speech and association is actually in jest and the aunt experiences arduous drudgery as opposed to the “grasshopper” who goes from sin to sin in joy (“Gracehoper”). The “little brothers and sisters” goad Shaun to speak, with “Bieni bussing him under his bonnet”⁷⁸ (*FW* 417.18-19) and surround him with “allallahbath of houris” (*FW* 417.27-28). This latter phrase would mean praise coming from “the muslim nymphs of paradise”, which would relate again to the Aunt and Grasshopper motif (373 in the Perry Index) which addresses the split between desire and duty, as the grasshopper of Aesop’s fable has long been associated with nymphs, in the sense of young girls.⁷⁹ Therein, as with the fable where both actors are needed to create the structure with one not being able to exist without the other, so are Shaun and Shem their *coniunctio*. Despite the fact that they cry out: “[S]haunti and shaunti and shaunti again!” (*FW* 408.33-4), Shaun has no bearing without the other.

The relationship of Shaun and Shem to HCE as *coincidencia oppositorum* is further seen when Shem accuses Shaun of the sin which is originally related to HCE. While Shaun is the part of the duo who is innocent by default “the justicers” (see *FW* 92-93) declare no crime having been committed. Shem is the one who lies, naturally, and represents the side of HCE which committed the sin.

⁷⁸ A repeated usage of having a bee in one’s bonnet but here used for Shaun, not Shem. Oddly, it would appear that the negative quality they may both share is they both are insistent on speaking their mind, at least presented from the sections herein reviewed.

⁷⁹ Nymph is also the word for a young immature grasshopper or cricket.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

The fact that Shaun cannot stop his brother is demonstrated further by this same *coincidencia oppositorum* archetype with their father HCE, as they are created from him as two parts of a whole. Shem and Shaun therefore literally become the top and bottom half of one person (HCE). The trying “to isolate i from my multiple Mes” (FW 410.12) is an epiphany that apparently Shaun has while the narrator still appears to be Shem nullifying their individual distinctiveness, itself underscoring to the reader that the identification are intentionally non-existent and not to be read as pure separate entities. Shaun’s/Shem’s explanation of why he had never worked is a dialogue unto itself with Shem/Shاون proffering: “There is no sabbath for nomads, and I mostly was able to walk, being too soft for work proper sixty off eilish miles a weak between three masses a morn and two chaplets at eve” (FW 410. 26-32).⁸⁰ On the surface, it does relate to the devout lending itself to order as Shaun as the upright son archetype would associate with. Yet, since he is the postman attending to the delivery of others, he is much like the proverb of “a rolling stone gathers no moss” much as Shaun is doomed to roll in his barrel, as a burden to himself, as deemed fated: “(O the sons of the fathers!) by the mightyfine weight of his barrel (all that prevented the happering of who if not the asterisks betwink themselves shall ever?)” (FW 426.30-32). Shem originates out of the inability for Shaun to redeem himself as he is of pure duty and little will. Shem is therein fated as much as Shaun to never being able to attend mass as it is in his nature to never rest in one place as the “Gracehopper”.

Shem seems to embody the oppositional archetype of humankind to be of good or ill-will. He, as the trickster archetype, harkens back to the ability to illuminate the truth, without whom existence would also not come into being. Much as the serpent in the garden of Eden, which *Finnegans Wake* as much emulates as anything else, Shem can be understood to be any harbinger that voices dissent and trickery but causes action to exist. Such tricksters may be found in Prometheus, Loki, Native American trickster gods, Judas, or, here, the Serpent in the Garden of Eden (see Campbell, *Myths to Live by* 23-4) who already knows the answer to the tree of knowledge, is allowed to exist to tempt Adam and Eve, and thereby brings about humanity. That being noted, Shem is the faux-character that symbolizes a fall and reemergence of humankind as with the fall of original sin echoed in the Sin of Phoenix Park. In this regard, Shem is the one to

⁸⁰ Incidentally, the “I” was lowered in a sentence which refers to Hitler’s Germany building the autobahn on which grey concentration camp inmates walk like the dead: “I am now becoming about fed up be going circulating about them new hikler’s highways like them nameless souls, ercked and scorned and grizzild all over, till it’s rusty October in this bleak forest” (FW 410.7-9).

answer the “first riddle of universe: “[w]hen is a man not a man?” (FW 170. 4-5) and offered a prize of “a bittersweet crab, a little present from the past” (FW 170.7-8). While one answers ‘when the heavens quakes’ (thunder), a second ‘when a Bohemian lisps’, a third said ‘when he is hungry and determined’, and next said ‘when he dies’, another ‘when he is drunk’, and another said ‘when he is married’, another ‘when papa fathered the nation’, one of wittiest said, ‘when he ate the apple and seemed so shaken’ (i.e., the fall), and another said ‘when he’s old and grey’, and still another ‘when the dead awaken’, and another, ‘when he is under-sized’, another ‘when he has no manners’, and one said ‘when pigs fly’. All were apparently wrong, when Shem offered up his answer of “when he is ... Sham”⁸¹ and took the prize (see FW 170). This answer itself not only reverberates the trickster archetype within him, it also accords with the answer of God in the Bible when Yahweh answers Moses “I am that I am” (Exodus 3:14) perhaps even linking him to HCE as part of the father god archetype that Shem partly embodies.

6.2.2. HCE – His Continual Eternity

HCE is the actual main character around which the assumed “events of the plot” occur. HCE bears many monikers. He is said to be named after his “earwick” (earwig) catching equipment (Humphrey Chimpden Earwicker) to which he greets the king’s hunting party: “Naw, yer madders, aw war jist a cotchin on thon bluggy earwuggers” (FW 31.10-11). Notwithstanding, HCE as a name is a clue into the nature of an archetypal character himself. As has been argued thus far, HCE is not merely a character but the top of a pyramid of associated characters that initially originate from him. If this is the case, it follows to a certain extent that HCE is the actual character and all others are but shadings of him and his wife ALP. Such argumentation safely follows from his acronym of “Here Comes Everybody” (FW 32.18-19) which directly implies that he is all characters, though this dissertation argues that he is all *animi*, following Jungian analysis, and his wife is all *animae*; although it must also be noted that both are their *coniunctio*, making up all existing characters of the novel itself. This assertion is supported by his other acronym, “Haveth Childers Everywhere” (FW 535.3-4) or the referred to the great “multipopulipater” (FW 81.5) and the “folkenfather of familyans” (FW 382.18) which would

⁸¹ “Shem himself, the doctator, took the cake, the correct solution being – all give it up? – ; when he is a – yours till the rending of the rocks, – Sham” (FW 170. 22-24).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

necessitate that the other “characters” be directly related to him, as he is “[A]n imposing everybody he always indeed looked constantly the same as and equal to himself and magnificently well worthy of any and all such universalisation” (*FW* 32.19-21). If approached in this manner, HCE can be read as being among the traditional gods of ancient times where their progeny merely come into existence as extensions of themselves and humanity arises out of their deeds. It follows that HCE would therefore emulate a god figure whose existence creates the universe itself. The fact that he is also a builder, who manages to impregnate his mate ALP in his construction outfit thereby producing the twins Shem and Shaun, underscores the implication that he creates the reality of the existence within *Finnegans Wake* as a godlike or religious figure. He may be akin to Adam or Abraham since his act of procreation mimics the Biblical commandment to multiply thereby creating humanity. This is particularly evident at the outset of the novel, during the “wake”, as Finnegan by name begins to be transformed into HCE, the line is said that “like Haroun Childeric Eggeberth he would caligulate by multiplicables the altitude and malltitude” (*FW* 4.29-33). Joyce here again utilizes multiple instances to underscore a singular point of HCE as a leader, this particularly reference to HCE multiplying the world as one uses the “Haroun” as in reference to the Caliph in *1001 Nights*, “Eggeberth” is Ecgbehrt the medieval West-Saxony king who established a united Saxon England, and the “caligulate”, the verb, to reference the Roman Emperor Caligula as much as to gather (see Fowler 220). By doing so, Joyce demarcates a line between the fall and the creation of humankind that issues forth from Finnegan as one, to HCE and ALP as two, to their offspring that begin to populate the novel, but always as figures leading back to a source. The empty leadership of being the embodiment and instigator of the creation of humanity and its existence is also called on when HCE is Napoleon onstage: “[a] veritable Napoleon the Nth, our worldstage’s practical jokepiece and retired cecelticocommediant in his own wise” (*FW* 33.2-4). The implication is that he may be the maniacal leader who has imitated humanity’s creation, either as a god or creator of humanity, but it is the practical joke on humankind to exist and the leader need not be as important in the lead role, as it were, merely fulfilling the role of Adam who fell/sinned.

As an eternal cyclical myth, every character is a number of degrees from creation, each degree off from the source of creation becoming worldlier and less divine. Eliade terms this movement originating from the divine myth to the profane reality “the metaphysical depreciation of history” (*Cosmos and History* 115) in which the fall from the purely divine origin of the myth

of creation to the historic, “in proportion to and by the mere fact of its duration, provokes an erosion of all forms by exhausting their [originally divine] ontologic substance” (*Cosmos and History* 115). Such a theory easily accounts for the distancing of characters from Finnegan through HCE onward. Since HCE is one degree distant from Finnegan, only ALP his equal, he is written to be in the same vein as a legendary hero who traditionally embodied a myth by carrying out remarkable deeds not capable of a man but still being human (such as Hercules or Karna who himself in the *Mahābhārata* goes by numerous names⁸²), bridging the gap between man-figure and god-figure. HCE is therefore not only a correspondingly mythological demigod; he falls further into the everyman figure who has many faults. Unlike the virtuous Shaun and the sinful Shem who are furthered derived from HCE making up his respective parts, HCE encompasses both their positive and negative characteristics. He is called “the *decent* man” (*FW* 262.1; emphasis added) noting he is both decent and indecent.

Despite all these associations of what HCE is and how he can be read, he is an ethereal nothing of the text who permeates it on every page but barely shows up directly. Rather, the questions of “Who is he? Whose is he? Why is he? Howmuch is he? Which is he? When is he? Where is he? How is he? And what the decans is there about him anyway, the decent man?” (*FW* 261-62) are what partially provide an impetus to an incongruent text. Platt notes that the *Wake* “has a questioning nature and carries a drive for epistemological order” (121), necessitating that questioning the nature of all things as well as where they have come from, what form they take, and where they are going to be at the heart of the *Wake*. The positing of questions and the lack of clarity is therefore no accident, but rather a frame of the novel in its further development of narrative and shaping the characters as they “emerge”.

There are elements beyond questioning that lead back to HCE as a creator of the reality within the novel. These may be found in the subplot of the byeboys, nameless characters who appear here or there, who are said to be carrying out the work of HCE continually addresses all throughout the novel. Akin to angels, demons, jinn, nymphs, fairies, spirits, elves, ghosts, and any other similar manifestation of beings left over from the original creation, they are direct

⁸² Benstock opines that “[T]he various names for Earwicker have their own necessary logic” (*Joyce Again’s Wake* 112). This is applicable particularly from a mythological standpoint, as, according to Campbell, “the chief divinity was the god[dess] of many forms and names” (*The Masks of God* 188; vol. 4).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

manifestations of HCE in his will and intentions,⁸³ as much as can be found in the text, not merely separate characters who represent corresponding but oppositional aspects as with Shaun and Shem. As if creating a device by which HCE can address all of the novel's world, the byebos are "twelve" who carry out an installation of radio/television by "their tolvvtubular high fidelity daildialler" (FW 309.14) instrument equipped with "supershielded umbrella antennas for distance" (FW 309.17-18), "a Bellini-Tosti coupling system with a vitaltone speaker" (FW 309.19) featuring "harmonic condenser enginium (the Mole)" and a "magazine battery called the Mimmim Bimbim" (FW 310.1-2) which is all incoherent gibber-gabber, but again refers back to Joyce using multiplied repetition to instill singular visual and conceptual meaning. The device being created is not a device *per se* but an analogous device for the instance of original creation being reverberated again through existence by the creator: "[W]hat sublation of compensation in the radification of interpretation by the byebos?" (FW 369.6-7). A religious individual may interpret this as the voice of (a) god influencing reality and the decisions of individuals. Hence, during the broadcast made using the "device" there is the figure of the Four Old Men – the "Mamalujo" (FW 397.11, 398.4, 476.32), who stand for the New Testament which, in Christian terms, is the "good news" spread of the coming of Jesus Christ and the Christian God's return to Earth.⁸⁴

⁸³ Although it is a general assertion found within the theology of many religious contexts, the natural and supernatural beings created by either a pantheon or monotheistic being are inherent to the divine nature of the creator(s) by a variance of degrees as related to the host. In support of such a general idea, Campbell notes in Jewish mythology that when the Israelites were on Mount Sinai and the heavens opened a multitude of angels appeared in the presence of them and Yahweh: "For God did not appear from one direction, but from all simultaneously, which, however, did not prevent His glory from filling the heaven as well as the earth" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 33). What deserves attention here is that Campbell underscores the fact that "[I]n spite of these innumerable hosts there was no crowding on Mount Sinai, no mob, there was room for all" (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 33). It follows, for Campbell and this dissertation, that mythic creation suggests an extension of the divine to all creation, where the beings representing the god(s) in a mythic context are extensions of the divine nature of creation. For *Finnegans Wake*, all "characters" are the extension of HCE and ALP, but the "byebos" are similar to the supernatural means or helpers by which he/she acts.

⁸⁴ The implication of religious epiphany is that a sudden realization changes the entire world for the individual, as has been much discussed within this dissertation in Joyce's application of it in his works. However, the actual religious origins of the *epiphany* stem from a knowledge gained, shared, encountered, or otherwise internalized that allows for a new world to be created from the mind's eye. Based upon this foundation, it is evident why HCE's broadcast changes the setting of the novel and its characters as Joyce is approaching the text not in his traditional epiphanic form, but the nature of what it espouses to be. Eliade argues that the historic occurrence of events becomes a holy epiphany as "they acquire a religious value that nothing had previously been able to confer on them" (*Cosmos and History* 104). For this reason, according to him, "the Hebrews were the first to discover the meaning of history as the epiphany of God, and this conception, as we should expect, was taken up and amplified by Christianity" (Eliade, *Cosmos and History* 104); i.e., the good news of Christ. However, religious epiphany comes from a divine source, comparable to HCE's radio broadcast that changes the Dublin of the novel.

The broadcasting device also illustrates the degrees of separation from the divine origin to the profane creation. As a god must intervene in the existence of creation, it shows that the perfection of the god figure or divine source of creation is not equivocal. Instead, reality is mutable in which the divine may intervene in the course of events. Furthermore, the fall and destruction is relevant to the creation as inherent to it – a duality in which one cannot exist without the other. This is partially evidenced by the extended description of the radio-televisual device in the background of Earwicker’s pub, when the episode concludes with a weather announcement of a depression – presumably expressing the author’s depression – but setting the tone for a fall, an imperfection in creation despite the announcement of HCE before. The imperfection of creation is more clearly represented by Kersse the Tailor, whose work is criticized with the reply that the client is hard to suit. The tailor who is an extension of HCE cannot create a perfect suit for an imperfect profane reality. Instead, the creation is merely relegated to repetition in a cyclic nature, as has been discussed. Therefore, the tailor as a “prophet” of HCE, as it were, is also “the teller” delivered by him to a very indifferent and uncomprehending reaction for “[W]ell, you know or don’t you kennet or haven’t I told you every telling has a tailing and that’s the he and the she of it” (*FW* 213.11-12). It is the tailing after the telling which is left to the reader and which *Finnegans Wake* revolves around.

6.2.3. *Making Love for the Whole World to See*

The above cited lines also transition into the chapter of Anna Livia Plurabelle to re-circle out of the mere fall into creation and back into the state of creation, as when HCE and ALP are united, usually in lovemaking, shifts occur within the text. As has been asserted number times thus far, ALP and HCE are two sides of a dual force of creation, but only initiate a new creation when merging together. Campbell notes that the lovemaking which they conduct is a symbolic act in and of itself, wherein a duality merges as one. The sexual act in literature is “a realization that beneath the illusion of two-ness dwells identity: ‘each is both’” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 260). However, the reestablishment of the duality into one is not limited to the duality alone as,

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

[T]his realization can expand into a discovery that beneath the multitudinous individualities of the whole surrounding universe ... dwells identity; whereupon the love experience becomes cosmic, and the beloved who first opened the vision is magnified as the mirror of creation. (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 260).

Therefore, the sexual combination is a reflection of creation in which all parts take place and which is not lost in *Finnegans Wake*. Lovemaking is an unsurprising technique used in the *Wake* whereby the *coniunctio* join back into their oneness, by which a new form of creation is started and a new cyclical nature may be made. To illustrate, the broadcast of lovemaking that does come using the device much later in the text re-forges HCE and ALP into corresponding characters the Porters, but also restructures the entire narrative through their introduction. Moreover, Eliade asserts that “in the case of ceremonial sexual union ... the individual ceases to live in profane and meaningless time, since he is imitating a divine archetype” (*Cosmos and History* 36). When Joyce uses access to this archetype of creation to imitate falling and failing in love – not merely within the broadcast, but within the broader spectrum of the novel, he is rewriting forms of creation myths. This is why, as HCE is making love to his wife at the beginning of the novel, one of the walls constituting the skyscraper falls due to a misplaced brick for which he blames ALP for handing him a sour apple as a clear association to Adam and Eve and their fall from grace.

The last session of lovemaking, before the dawn and before the novel resets, reflects a circular recreation in which HCE and ALP become the Porters, but then finally transform into the respective duality of dirt and river by which the novel supposedly ends or returns to the very beginning. The children, the twins Shem and Shaun, but now Jerry and Kevin as they have been reunited and transformed from their discussion in the cemetery, witness their parents lovemaking as do four bedposts named Matthew, Mark, Luke and John after the four gospels, except that their names are “Matthew Gregory”, “Mark Lyons”, “Luke Tarpey”, and “Johnny MacDougal” (*FW* 384.7-8,11), respectively. They not only symbolize the four gospels, they also stand for the four provinces of Ireland, and, even more pertinent to the fact, the four stages in

Vico's circular version of history – the Divine, Heroic, Human, and *Ricorso*.⁸⁵ This lovemaking is therefore a culmination of all stages.

Each “bedpost” describes the love-making from a different angle as it is broadcasted to the world by the radio/television instrument, described as: “[p]hotoflashing it far too wide. It will be known through all Urania soon. Like jealousjoy titaning fear; like rumour rhean round the planets; like china's dragon snapping japets; like rhodagrey up in the east Satyrdaysboost besets Phoebe's nearest” (*FW* 583.15-19). As is typical of Joyce's style, he here makes use of multiple instances in order to create one specific detailed image. This section alludes to the Titans (“Urania”/ “titaning”) of Cronus (“Urania”), Iapetus (“japets”), and Phoebe as being created as brother and sister. Moreover, Joyce also utilizes an allusion to the “Satyr”, the Greek/Roman nymph representing male sexuality. Allusion aside, Joyce here is eliciting the creation myth again as a basis for the cyclical motif by which life is re-envisioned, concluding on the basis of this act by which sexual nature reinvigorates and reforms creation: “Here's the flood and the flaxen flood that's to come over helpless Irryland” (*FW* 583.19-20). It may therefore be interpreted that Joyce is writing another recreation based on these allusions of multiple “titans” birthing together.

A subtext, however, does seem to exist that with multiple ages also come multiple interpretations, which is why the four bedposts represent a distinct gospel, which agree with one another but have their own additions as well, as revealed in their discussion of the events. The “Mark” bedpost, for instance, talks about the sexual position of “bad sex”, the “second position of discordance” (*FW* 564.1-2). Mark's observation is that HCE takes the upper position in love-making. In this stance, HCE beholds Jerry and Kevin/Shem and Shaun peeping and see, to their amazement, HCE's behind featuring in detail Phoenix Park where the attempted seduction of the two little girls had taken place. It is given as a tourist guide description: A “straight road” (*FW* 564.10), “bisexes” (bisects) the park (*FW* 564.11), with “vinesregent's lodge” (*FW* 564.13) (Viceregal's Lodge) on one cheek and “chief sacristary's residence” (Chief Secretary's Lodge) on the other side (*FW* 564.15). While the viewing of HCE itself implies a violation of the Biblical injunction against uncovering the nakedness of the father, thereby challenging his patriarchal authority, what gets to the marrow of the novel is that this scene comes in reference to

⁸⁵ See Campbell, *A Skeleton Key* (8, 43n, 86-87), Tindall, *Guide to James Joyce* (245) or Burgess, *ReJoyce* (246).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

an earlier episode when HCE was observed in the park in his sordid affair with the two girls – the original sin of the novel. The behind of the “titan” identified sometimes with Dublin and sometimes with all of Ireland (the head in the North, the rest of the Irish Republic) is here given as proof of the “sin” in the form of HCE. The sin, up to this point has been constantly covered but never confirmed. HCE’s buttocks are the parallel for when the sin is revealed from the point of creation into history, all of creation returns to that point and either falls back into itself or is recreated as a new world. For this very reason, HCE dissolves into the “Phoenix Park” as a simile, as he is to re-emerge like the phoenix. Burgess points out that this instance of “physical love between these two seems to end here forever” (*A Shorter FW* 247) since they no longer are their human physical forms in the novel of HCE and ALP – instead the Porters, the river, and the land. When the act of making love is interrupted by the cry of one of the twins, all of these characters transform into new forms: the twins become Kevin (St. Kevin the only son); HCE and ALP are the Porters who go back to bed and copulate again, but their love making is broadcasted by the Four Old Men (the Gospels). The sin as dissolving into a recreation is transferred into the Porters, but they read about it in the morning papers, and, much like the original sin of the fall is thereafter inherited to all as well, since it has been made widely known.

Albeit the sin is ever present, it has not been touched upon here yet as the archetypes of representation have been more thoroughly examined. Notwithstanding the sin does play a major recurring theme as a guilt motif which is returned to but does not necessarily make up the “plot” of the story. Nothing occurs more as a development but as a repetition from which nothing essentially concludes except for this final act of lovemaking. In essence, sin is a motif that is returned to through its allusions to “characters” of who did what when, but all are guilty, save for ALP.

This is no accident; Joyce is purposefully writing out a concept of original sin and its transference to others in human existence, analyzing in a Joycean manner the meaning of suffering as originating from the Westernized term of original sin, otherwise asked “Why must there be suffering at all?” Positing such a question is nothing novel, but Joyce’s attempt to write out an answer to it within literature is. By incorporating a multitude of forms into the narrative, Joyce tries to re-establish a world created mythically to explain “the fall” of humankind, whose existence is reliant on the sin and the suffering. The numerous forms Joyce presents aim to mimic a mythic existence, where “the world is a majestic harmony of forms pouring into being,

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

exploding, and dissolving. But what the swiftly passing creatures experience is a terrible cacaphony of battle cries and pain” (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 267). *Finnegans Wake* absorbs the suffering of existence and seeks to explain it in its mythic form as being inherent to rise and fall of humankind. As much as,

[T]he myths do not deny this agony (the crucifixion); they reveal within, behind, and around it, essential peace (the heavenly rose). The shift of perspective from the repose of the central Cause to the turbulation of the peripheral effects is represented in the Fall of Adam and Eve. (Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 267-8)

Joyce’s characters also do not merely stand for the cause of the fall but the creation the fall gives impetus to. Thereby, by incorporating the fall of Finnegan as the fall of HCE as well as the son(s) to mimic the same human suffering inherent to the mythic structure which itself seeks to answer the why of human suffering. Joyce establishes a source of collective unconscious that speaks of the universal human experience of suffering and joy through a meandering myth. Eliade would note that this myth provides a framework to the suffering caused by existence. He terms this issue of suffering as the “terror of history”, which the individual attempts to escape through many means. However, for Eliade, all lead from an apposition of the suffering of one’s life against the mythic archetypal construct assembled prior to it – which provides a meaning for the pain of existence as opposed to its randomness. In that, he notes that the mythic archetype

gave value to suffering: transforming pain from a negative condition to an experience with a positive spiritual content. The assertion is valid insofar as it refers to a giving of value to suffering and even to a seeking out of pain for its salutary qualities. (Eliade, *Cosmos and History* 86)

Joyce, in addressing the concept of sin, wrote this work as an exegesis on the concept providing his own interpretation by archetypal means fitting a myth of his own making.

6.2.4. Anna Livia Plurabelle: The One Worth Staking Everything On⁸⁶

The assumption that has herein been argued within the text is that the characters of *Finnegans Wake* are only fitting archetypes and motifs, specifically as a devolvement of one source into many and *vice versa*. While it may be assumed that Finnegan was the initiator of the “myth”, representing a source of creation, it has also been argued that the creation doubles into two opposites that emerge as one (*coniunctio*) and relate to a third (*coincidencia oppsitorum*). As HCE and ALP are two parts of one totality, whereas HCE embodies the sin, ALP does not. Shem as being the sinner against Shaun comes in support of this assertion, as only the *animi* are capable of the sin as well. In stark contrast, the *animae* do not sin or are not concerned with the sin outside of being subjected to the effects of it.

If the original sin of the Western mind is taken into account within *Finnegans Wake*, in its historic and mythic context in the Catholic Christian tradition of which Joyce was brought up and educated, Joyce would certainly have been conscious of the common blame of the Church against woman for the fall from Eden. Particularly in regards to the fact that woman would have been presented to him as temptress, the one who originally sins and causes man to sin, and mother, who gives birth to all of humanity. Joyce not only does take this into account in the *Wake*, but also strives to combine two aspects of the archetype of woman as mother (giving life to, the fertile one) and the association of temptress (the giver of the apple, the opener of Pandora’s box) in ALP and her daughter Issy, respectively. If anything, given that ALP transforms into a river that gives life to the events of the novel, she is the primal Mother Earth goddess, “the Great Container” (Neumann 25) who “tends to hold fast to everything that springs from it and surround it like an eternal substance” (Neumann 25). She cannot help but be the mother of creation to all things, as Anna Livia “identifies with Eva of Genesis and with Áine, ‘the mother of Irish gods’” (Quintelli-Neary 97) even existing as the beacon of creation with HCE who commits the “sin/crime”. She is the primary creator, the eternal fertile substance; HCE is merely an actor furthering creation in it as he acts within it. To wit, HCE is an instigator of the sin, but when his sin is revealed through revelation, he dissolves into ALP since she is the

⁸⁶ Referring to Joyce’s commentary on Anna Livia’s character: “‘Anna Livia Plurabelle,’ the showpiece of *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce said he was ‘prepared to stake everything’” (qtd. in Bishop, *Joyce’s Book of the Dark: FW* 336). Also in *Letters* III 163.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

mother aspect of the creation myth of the novel, since “[E]verything born of it [the mother goddess] belongs to it and remains subject to it; and even if the individual becomes independent, the Archetypal Feminine relativizes this independence into a nonessential variant of her own perpetual being” (Neumann 25). All points lead to Anna Livia, the river in a constant flow, as well as this blossoming mother archetype who gives birth to eternal creation. ALP is “[M]ore than wife and temptress” (Tindall, *A Reader’s Guide to FW* 143). Resorting once more to the repetitive illustration of symbology used throughout Joyce’s works, especially within *Finnegans Wake*, ALP is certainly given the attributes of the feminine creator through the language of flowers, being described as the “languish of flowers” (*FW* 96.11), “florilingua” (*FW* 117.14), and “languo of flows” (*FW* 621.22). Yet, much like the flower of male and female parts for reproduction, united with HCE, ALP is whole and may recreate the existences presented in the novel.

ALP may not have committed the sin, but as the corresponding part to her husband is representative of it in opposition. As the mother goddess, the sin cannot exist without her as well, even when not participating in it. While the “sin” is made public, she actively strives to disassociate herself from it by issuing a “mamafesta” (*FW* 104.4.) called, among many names, the “*Rockabill Booby in the Wave Trough*” (*FW* 104.6-7) in which she renounces her husband as variably a sea-beast and the baby who falls with his cradle from the tree-top of the lullaby. She does much to denounce him even while showing her support, evident in the text where Anna Livia states: “*I loved you better nor you knew*” (*FW* 202.10-11). She is the character neglected by HCE, her husband, who is frequently considered a tyrant.

As opposed to the beautiful light in which ALP is recurrently shown, HCE is described in a comprehensively negative light himself. He is ascribed the qualities of “[t]he brontoichthyan form outlined aslumbered, even in our own nighttime” (*FW* 7.20-21), which befits the monster (shadow) of the unconscious commonly coming to the surface within dreams where HCE rules the dreamlike state of *Finnegans Wake*. Such similar aspects of his monstrous nature are sporadically made throughout the text, often being written and portrayed as such. For instance, though already noted in brief, he is the character who is “hiding the crumbends of his enormousness in the areyou” (*FW* 102.6). This statement is perhaps even hinting to the fact that his harmful natures haunt the unconscious of the “areyou” of “what you are”. Yet, otherwise discussed thus far in brief, he is the one who is rumored to have committed the sin of trying to

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

persuade two urinating young girls in Phoenix Park to remove their clothing as he shows them his penis, after he “drapped has draraks an Mansianhase parak” (FW 491.18) even becoming “Mr Hairwigger who has just hadded twinned little curls” (FW 491.30-31) which is taken to mean seen the pubic hair of two “twin girls” involved in his “voyeurism”. In short, he is a lecherous old man in many regards and considerations. A “satyr” preying on young nymphs, he seems to despicably disguise himself for the seduction of little girls in sweets, that is, “camouflaged as a blancmange and maple syrop!” (FW 494.21) while reading to the girls: “Citizens’ Obedience Is City’s Happiness”⁸⁷ to get them to strip themselves of their trousers or “sitinins” (see McHugh, *Annotations to FW* 494). He ends up being walled in his own building listing all the bad names he had been called in the book: “Earwicker, ... in the sititout corner of his conservatory, behind faminebuilt walls, ... compiled, ... a long list (now feared in part lost) to be kept on file of all abusive names he was called” (FW 70.35-71.6). Given HCE’s nature, he encompasses all suffering and sin within the novel, as Burgess relates him being in conjunction with “all guilty lovers, from Tristram to Parnell, and even with the great god-giant Finnegan whose prehistoric fall still has the whole world ... rumbling” (*ReJoyce* 246), his shadow casts the guilt motive inherent to life onto the mother of creation. As the opposite but corresponding side, ALP therefore clearly stands in stark contrast to HCE. The former representing classical forms of beauty, in a sense, while the latter the sublime terror of comprehending existence.

Since ALP has a reserved function as being the ground from which all things do occur, she is “Annah the Allmaziful, the Everliving, the Bringer of Plurabilities” (FW 104.1-2). As the mother goddess, she stands irreproachable despite any claim made against her. The two washerwomen by the Liffey gossip about seemingly cleansing her (Anna Livia) of sin in their obvious excitement and expression of desire. They call HCE “an awful old reppe” (FW 196.11), “the roughy old rappe” (FW 196.24) but compare her clothes to being immaculate, only tainted by his sins. The washerwomen themselves are also extensions of ALP as the “byeboys” are, or Shem and Shaun, of HCE, providing a different voice for a commentary on the characters by a further division within the anima side of the totality. Their speech as originating from the mother goddess division implies innocence to the nature of sin against creation, wherein the creation

⁸⁷ The motto of Dublin city is “Obedientia civium urbis felicitas” and can be translated as “The obedience of the citizens produces a happy city” (see Warburton, *History of the City of Dublin* 1062). This reference is found in a text of *Finnegans Wake*: “To obedient of civicity in urbanious at felicity” (FW 277.7-8).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

itself is not a “sin” but the actions taken within it. They also are doppelgangers to Shem and Shaun, as Tindall ascribes them, “themselves the rivals ... A.L.P.’s ‘swapsons’... gossiping about their mother” (*Guide to FW* 147). They also merge into tree and stone as well, necessitating one aspect grounded in the profane and another in the divine source of creation.

Whereas Shem and Shaun provide a dual layer of the character antagonism to HCE, the washerwomen are the appended *animae* to ALP as much as all feminine symbols or characters are within the text, but do not share an animosity between them – even if rivals. Instead, they are thoughts of Anna Livia, her debating conscious of two sides talking to one, harkening back to Molly conversing with herself. As Anna Livia is the river, as the washerwomen interact with the river, it is actually the ALP side of the text speaking for herself.

The lines most familiar of:

O

tell me all about

Anna Livia! I want to hear all

About Anna Livia. Well, you know Anna Livia? Yes, of course (*FW* 196. 1-4),

which the washerwomen open their dialogue with. Tindall argues that the “O” is akin to the “yes” used by Molly Bloom in her soliloquy, a marker Joyce relies on to differentiate meaning (so to speak) between moments in dialogue (see *Guide to FW* 141). From this assertion, it may also be gathered that this is written in the same style, as a conversation of the self. It therefore would be safe to assume or to read the text as one woman talking or debating with herself, such as a washerwoman (not women). The point is moot, as even if they are two distinct characters they can be argued as one given the framework that has been laid out here being *coniunctio*. Therefore, they need not be on two banks, literally opposing one another, but be of two minds of one character who is embodied by them and the river of Anna Livia flowing in between. The reading of the text in this manner lends itself to clarity when “one” states: “[W]ash quit and don’t be dabbling. Tuck up your sleeves and loosen your talktapes” (*FW* 196.7-9) as it could just as easily appear to sound as if a person talking to themselves to get a job done, to keep themselves from distraction. Under this assumption, the “whatever it was they threed to make out he thried to two in the Fiendish park” (*FW* 196.9-11) would be one woman reminding herself of the

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

relationship to her “husband” as “no matter what they say” as it is the mother goddess whose love supersedes the guilt of the sin. Yet, it just as much could be two washerwomen gossiping while doing the job – such usage of real and codified symbology is core to the novel’s writing.

Further following this line of interpretation, as well as referencing again its correspondence to Molly’s soliloquy, the washerwomen begin to speak of other lovers that Anna Livia had enjoyed before HCE, similar to Molly also recalling other lovers as such before returning to Bloom. One is distinctly recalled who was a religious man, “a local heremite, Michael Arklow” (*FW* 203.18) who lived “under Horsepass bridge” (*FW* 203.2). While the washerwomen retell of the sexual bond between Anna Livia and Michael, imagery of the river is used to describe it: “sweet and so cool and so limber she looked ... he plunged both of his newly anointed hands ... in her singimari saffron strumans of hair” (*FW* 203.20-24). Sexual in nature assuredly, Joyce has taken the effort to use this imagery as related to the river in order to be similar to the body of HCE dissolving into ALP as Anna Livia is the river herself. What is more, as has already been detailed, when ALP combines sexually with HCE, a new existence is made. However, with Michael, this existence that should follow is left out. If the framework of Jungian analysis is correct, Michael should be an animus of HCE but this may be interpreted as not being the likely case. Since nothing is known or said outside of Michael’s and Anna Livia’s sexual union, there is no foundation to assume as such. What might be pointed out here, given the mirroring of three major female characters in Joyce’s work, is that Michael is a story entirely different to that of *Finnegans Wake*. A possible explanation is that Michael is another existence entirely in which ALP was, but HCE was not, and instead it was Michael who was the “sinner” or “creator” of events as HCE is for the *Wake*. Taking into account that Molly had lovers before Bloom in *Ulysses* and Greta did before Gabriel in “The Dead”, if this is a mythic retelling, ALP represents the fertile goddess of creation from which everything stems (whereby, her union with HCE allows everything to come), and Michael would be a completely different tale altogether before HCE. This would account for the “living under a bridge” that unites both river banks of Anna Livia. Furthermore, it would lend credence to the washerwomen being ALP as they know the secret feelings of pleasure she held, which Joyce usually does not provide privy to when outside the character but only imitating from the character. Finally, if Michael is read as a string of lovers uniting with ALP, this would also be in accordance with the *ricorso* of Vico where the creation of history comes in and out of existence, but does not necessarily repeat the same cast of

characters within it. Vico claims that history is repeated, but not necessarily by the same individuals in a replica of one to another. Rather, he posits that the axioms of history compel it to cycle, as “this ideal eternal history only so far ... makes it by that proof ‘it had, has, and will have to be’” (*The New Science* 93). The eternal nature of Vico’s cyclical history results in it being inescapable, but not homogenous. The three eras of history are utterly reliant upon the human foundations that interpret each instance of their becoming: “For the first indubitable principle above posited is that this world of nations has certainly been made by men, and its guise must therefore be found within the modifications of our own human mind” (*The New Science* 93). It then follows that if Vico is the foundation on which Joyce wrote the *Wake*, Michael would be one of these characters who has been of a different cycle not relevant to the history of HCE, but is to ALP.

Albeit this interpretation of the washerwomen’s “confession” may seem eccentric at first reading, it does correspond with Campbell’s views on the history of mythology in which he asserts that time had a much more cyclical view prior to the establishment of Manichaeism standpoint of opposing forces being a drive of history. According to Campbell, “when creator and creature were not the same” (*The Masks of God* 7; vol. 2), as opposed to this reading of *Finnegans Wake* where it is argued that the creator and created are one “body” of many parts, there was “a development away from the earlier static view of returning cycles” (*The Masks of God* 7; vol. 2).⁸⁸ In other words, the cyclic view of mythology as espoused by Campbell, Eliade, and Vico, as well as returning to it in one’s collective unconscious as claimed by Jung, was replaced when “[A] progressive, temporally oriented mythology arose, of a creation, once and for all, at the beginning of time, a subsequent fall, and a work of restoration, still in progress” (Campbell, *The Masks of God* 7; vol. 2). Philosophy aside, the best support that can be offered to guard for this interpretation of a cyclic-mythological reading of *Finnegans Wake* is that the ideas of the text are far more coherent reading it in this manner than approaching the novel as an otherwise modern progressive text in which character arc and antagonism give way to the protagonist’s triumph.

⁸⁸ Joseph Campbell frequently proffered as example of this understanding of a continual nature of existence through mythology the Hindu myth of Indra and the Ants, where Brahma tells Indra that each ant in a line represents a universe that has been created and ended and which has had its own variety of Indra. The myth aims to show that repetitive instances of what is considered to be unique throughout a history, as opposed to the universal nature of its creation. As related to *Finnegans Wake*, which may be interpreted in the same manner, Michael and HCE could simply be different “Indras” (see Campbell, *The Power of Myth* 88).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

Read as a myth where the mother goddess of the earth bears the birth of an existence, the novel comes together in a more faceted manner. When Anna Livia is the river⁸⁹ who runs throughout the events of the novel as the “riverrun” throughout the city, the Dublin of *Finnegans Wake* is born. Quintelli-Neary makes the argument that she not only is a river goddess but one of Irish relation, since “the Irish root *eanach* (‘water’ or ‘fen’) or *abhainn* (river) ... identifies [Anna Livia] with an Irish body of water and finds her source in the sacred center of Ireland” (98).

When Finnegan falls, HCE does come to rise, the male counterpart, whose actions create not the world but the actions unfolding. As much as has therefore been discussed of HCE, ALP has been claimed to have a triangular form that connects these three concepts as based on three points: 1) as the primary anima against animus she is half the inherent part of creation; 2) as a “character” she unites with HCE (or any other animus) to create a cycle of existence; and 3) as the river she gives birth to and falls back into the sea thereby ending the tale of existence. As the river, ALP flows through all these points, creating the triangle, or, as Tindall notes, “she is the brook of life” (*Guide to James Joyce* 279). Joyce perhaps could even be echoing Genesis 2:10: “[a] river went out of Eden to water the garden” where water gives life to the land where there had been none.

As the proverbial garden opens, breathing in life the creation of Dublin as an “Eden”, the river circles through and gives way to the washerwomen. As has been established, they are the extension of ALP. As they come to the river at night – again emulating Genesis as night has not yet been divided from day – they begin to hold a conversation where they seemingly are not able to understand one another due to the sound of the river and the life coming around them. Yet, it might also be read as an incantation of the creation of life given its position in the beginning of the novel as the “river runs”:

Can't hear with the waters of. The chittering waters of. Flittering bats, fieldmice
bawk talk. Ho! Are you not gone ahome? What Thom Malone? Can't hear with
bawk of bats, all thim liffeying waters of. Ho, talk save us! (*FW* 215.31-34)

⁸⁹ ALP is deliberately even written in this way, as Tindall has pointed out, “[T]he first three lines of her chapter compose typographically, a delta, suitable for a river and calling to mind the triangle on a bottle of Bass” (*Guide to FW* 141).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

While Joyce has attempted to recreate the “[R]hythm of Dublin speech” (Benstock, *Joyce Again’s Wake* 162) as well as “the colloquial flavor of its composition” (*Joyce Again’s Wake* 162)⁹⁰ throughout the whole work, here it masks the true nature of the words being said. Joyce, in his common multiple repetition, returns to the “liffeying” (*FW* 215.33-4) water (even alluding to Finnegan’s whiskey) in order for it to be intersected by mention of the life that is springing up around the washerwomen in forms of onomatopoeia, as if Anna Livia was the mother goddess of the Earth who could not hear as her creation created the clamor of life around her. The washerwomen are used as vocal means similar to the chorus in a Greek tragedy, providing a voice to speak to the reader, filling in the information as it goes. The end of the incantation, says enough of the life created, tell me the tale of the creation of existence formed now by HCE and ALP, hence the “Ho, talk save us!” (*FW* 215.34) which will lead the incantation of the tale through speaking, the only means of retelling through the story:

I feel as old as yonder elm. A tale told of Shaun or Shem? All Livia’s daughters. Dark hawks hear us. Night! Night! My ho head halls. I feel as heavy as yonder stone. Tell me of John or Shaun? Who were Shem and Shaun the living sons or daughters of? (*FW* 215.34-36, 216.1-2)

The passage does call for the tale to be told in “a tale of Shaun or Shem” so the story begins. However, upon closer examination to note how that characters return to their beginnings at the

⁹⁰ The commonsense knowledge that one should read *Finnegans Wake* aloud does have its place among commentaries as well as advise to the daunting young reader. Joyce did take efforts to produce a purely spoken Irish tongue onto the page as the novel lacks any pure forms of narration or non-objective third person observance. Benstock claims that this is done as to underscore the lyrical nature of it, as a prose poem: “Only by wagging his English tongue in his Celtic mouth does an Irishman produce such lyrical comedy” (*Joyce Again’s Wake* 162). In fact, if it is to be read as anything, this specific chapter as well as “[t]he whole book is one long gossip tale told at a hurried pace in a hushed tone” (Benstock, *Joyce Again’s Wake* 162), meaning it is meant to be spoken and heard, not read silently in one’s inner monologue. Joyce himself was able to record snippets of the reading, in 1929 in Bristol, “[H]e found time also to record the last pages of *Anna Livia* for Ogden at the Orthological Institute; the pages had been prepared for him in half-inch letters, but the light in the studio was so weak that Joyce still could not read them. He had therefore to be prompted in a whisper throughout, his achievement being, as Ogden said, all the more remarkable” (Ellmann, *James Joyce* 617). By following this, even if it is hushed, one can get a feel for the intentions of how Joyce saw the novel to be presented and thereby understood. Hear Joyce reading pages 213-216 from *Anna Livia Plurabelle* (Book I.8); recording available at Public Domain Review: <http://publicdomainreview.org/collections/james-joyce-reading-his-work-19241929/>

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

end, both Shaun/Shem and the washerwomen can be seen as related to the tree and stone as has been cited numerous times thus far. The “old as yonder elm” (*FW* 215.34-5) cites the divine nature of the archetype inspiring creation; the “heavy as yonder stone” (*FW* 216.1) is the weight felt by the same. Here it is also evidenced that the washerwomen are the anima correspondent to Shaun and Shem as “the daughters of” (*FW* 216.2) as opposed to “the sons of” Anna Livia. Conspicuously seen in their conclusion is that the tale refers back to the creation as being revealed through the tale itself: “Telmetale of stem or stone. Beside the rivering waters of, hitherandthithering waters of. Night!” (*FW* 216.3-5)

The archetypal motif of the creation and fertility is represented further by the river in all sections of the novel; particularly it is brought to bear when shifts in “characters” emerge. A prime example is when a retrospective confession by Shaun occurs through his remembrance of a dream: railing out against himself and his brother, Shaun is only cleansed by finally giving himself to the river. As he wanders to the riverbank at midnight, he struggles with thoughts of his *coniunctio* – Shem – specifically how he felt unworthy of his position of postman and how he is the real writer of the letter (a sign that the two are one). At midnight in the dream, when he hears “the peal of vixen’s laughter among midnight’s chimes from out the belfry” (*FW* 403.20-21), the subtext is that not only is this both the end and start of a new day, but that Anna Livia Plurabelle is the female laughter coming from the chimes.⁹¹ As Shaun is but one aspect of HCE, the chiming can be concluded as such that the impetus in opposition he receives against himself, is spurned on by ALP in line with the anima/animus complimenting principle of Jung. Shaun then remarks using imagery of water flowing on a river at night, which is the time ALP as the river comes to the fore: “[g]listery gleam darkling adown surface of affluvial flowandflow as again might seem garments of laundry reposing a leasward” (*FW* 404.1-2). As Shaun dives in after this moment, it might be argued that this dream motif represents the ego being disrupted by the unconscious, as it emerges into the metaphor of the waters of the unconscious which reflect darkness back in night. It may also be asserted that the waters, in this sense of which Anna Livia is, return back to the basic dream-like state of unconscious sensibilities from which the novel is commonly associated; chiefly in Shaun’s dream state. Notwithstanding, when Shaun and Shem are able to be seen as one, the river is present as their origin stems from it. Since as brothers they

⁹¹ This is perhaps the sounds of washerwomen laughter or an allusion, but it does relate to the feminine.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

are merely one, when Shaun sees a self-recognition in this fact, he returns back to the root of creation as he retreats into the unconscious.

It might be that this instance of the novel seems less relevant than others to cite, but as ALP ends the text by transforming into a river that flows back into the sea, as she had originally become to begin the text, all the main characters also dissolve their identities in the whole of “nonland of where’s please (and it was when you and they were we)” (FW 403.18-19) in the end. Therein, Shaun’s dive into the river as stated is mere foreshadowing of the event, giving this section of the novel more pertinence on closer examination. The apparent admitting of Shaun as Shem establishes them as one. Symbolically, he then submerges into the source as the *coincidentia oppositorum* in which Shem and Shaun are HCE as opposed to ALP, by which their mutual antagonisms resolve by merging into one.

This concept of delving back into ALP is crucial since the novel’s denouement is the Dublin of its creation falling back in on itself as ALP, the Anna Livia of the river, withdraws into the sea, into which all characters who were divided now revert back to the source. Through the river emptying, the characters who are presented as repetitive archetypal dualities of a whole join together to illustrate themselves as one. As ALP begins and ends the novel as its river goddess, she gives forth life and takes it away. As the river withdraws from the Dublin of *Finnegans Wake*, it takes with it the properties that allowed for creation to even occur. By flowing into the land, she divided it into its parts, by flowing out, they reconcile as one and divisions are removed.

The canyon separating the creator and its creation fuses as one much as the anima and animus figures as symbolized through archetypes of husband and wife, brothers and sister, father and mother, land and sea, are one. Therein lies the representation of the repeated usage of archetypal forms which is characteristic to Joyce, being layered repeatedly and by which Anna Livia “return[s] to her father, the sea, that produces the cloud which makes the river, and her father is also her husband, to whom she gives herself as a bride to her groom” (Ellmann, *JJ* 253). Anna Livia Plurabelle herself as a character unites with the animus counterpart of the sea, merging into one unique source of which there is no division. When in the form of the river of life she flowed against the animus of the land, the division creating the Dublin of *Finnegans Wake* from the totality of its two parts. Her river state was but the symbol to the role of topology in folklore in “the fusion of water (Anna) and hill (her spouse)” (Quintelli-Neary 98).

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

Anna Livia is the river, yet the river itself is a symbol both of birth and destruction. It is somewhat common knowledge that the floodings of the Nile gave it both fertility and destruction, but this is true of all great rivers which societies have navigated and depended on for trade, fishing, water, and life into prehistory. The river has been seen as a source of life and a potential for death, its flow as well marking “the irreversible passage of time and, in consequence, for a sense of loss and oblivion” (Cirlot 194). It is always in a state of flux, much like the developments of life. “The river is not a ‘body’ of water but a stream: with its flow and its floodings, it functions not statically but dynamically, and it becomes the basis for the historical reckoning of time itself” (Biederman 285). The river as it gives birth to the Wakean Dublin flows into the land and when it withdraws the water overtakes the land. Based upon a cyclical myth reading of the text, the cycle may only come full circle when the beginning and end meet as they are both a simultaneous commencement and culmination into one another. As the flow of the Anna Livia river suggests, it is also in a cycle for which the river flows into and out of. The river, as opposed to the sea, stands symbolically for water that brings life to the land, not the salt water of the latter whose depths are dark and whose water is deadly to it: “[t]he fresh water passes into the salt, a bitter ending” (Ellmann, *JJ* 253). Indeed, the character in multiple ways gives utterance to a monologue that recants herself away from the creation, almost disillusioned by it, bitterly incanting the end of the world.

ALP outrightly rejects all the worldly affairs that have concerned her up to this point, having grown tired and weary of them. Even when interpreted as the mother goddess of creation, her incantation brings about the end through the rejection of the mundane: “A hundred cares, a tithe of troubles and is there one who understands me? ... All me life I have been lived among them but now they are becoming lothed to me” (*FW* 627.14-17). The monologue, considering the implications of her becoming one with the sea, may also be interpreted as the confession of a suicide note, being one individual who throws themselves off the cliffs to the sea below, consuming them. However, even this interpretation lends credence to that of a retraction of commitment to the world. As in, “If I die, let the whole world die with me for my cessation is an end to all”. ALP thinks as much to herself: “I done me best when I was let. Thinking always if I go all goes” (*FW* 627.13-14), which may be read as either a woman, mother, wife or other strong female character who is the backbone of a struggling Irish family, or, along the lines of a broader

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

archetypal association, as the mother archetype who lends herself in creating others such as the mother goddess.

Burgess claims that the more distant she grows from the Dublin of *Finnegans Wake*, i.e. the actualities of the profanity of existence, she also grows distant from her husband. “As she approaches her great father, the sea, how alien from nobility, how petty seems her husband the hill and the city” (Burgess, *ReJoyce* 336). As read according to the archetypal criticism that has been thus applied, as an anima, she is never singular due to the animus archetype (the same applied for the animus of whether HCE or the father sea cannot be without the anima). The profane as divorced from the divine source of origin, as has been thus suggested, would explain why the creation once forged falls apart in the disillusionment. ALP confesses the point itself, stating: “I thought you were all glittering with the noblest of carriage. You’re only a bumpkin. I thought you the great in all things, in guilt and in glory. You’re but a puny” (*FW* 627.21-24). Albeit this may be in reference to the husband, HCE, it is also for all the city of the *Wake* hence the “[I] thought you were all glittering”. The “all” is in reference to all parts of the profane life of the city that had been created as well as the multifarious manifestations of HCE. The point of the matter is that the Goddess here is recanting existence, thereby opening the figurative “seventh seal” and forcing it to disappear. When ALP professes, “[B]ut I’m loathing them that’s here and all I lothe. Loonly in me loneness. For all their faults. I am passing out” (*FW* 627.33-34), the lines betray the character as being entirely separate and becoming out of joint with her “life” and the city as it is portrayed, feeling alienated from it. Read still as the archetypal structure of the cyclical myth, this is a maltheistic statement where the creator begins to despise the creation. “The passing out” which Anna Livia espouses to feel is passing from this reality as not being able to bear the weight of the profane any longer. If read as cyclical myth, the novel here is entering the end times in which all withdraws back into the source of creation. As the world ends when Vishnu stops dreaming, when heaven and hell come to meet on Earth, those things which were made disparate from the source of divinity are too profane to exist any longer and succumb to a convergence into one another once more. Campbell defines these moments of intersection where the creation meets its end as being “of a single mythological theme... the down-going and the up-coming (*kathados* and *anodos*)” (*The Hero with a Thousand Faces* 26-7). The intersection in between the fall and the rise is a moment of zero which contains both possibilities.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

As is clear at the close of the novel, Anna Livia is herself torn between loyalty to her family created with HCE and abandoning them. Joyce generally signals such internal antagonism by using the tree and stone symbol which has been detailed. When used, it indicates a pull between two extremes. When Anna cites herself as the tree in this regard, she calls herself the tree, but without grounding in the stone unlike Shaun/Shem and the washerwomen. “Soft morning, city! ... I am leafy speaking. ... Foltly and foltly all the nights have falled on to long my hair. Not a sound, falling. ... No wind no word. Only a leaf, just a leaf and then leaves” (FW 619.20-23). Whether this is a sign that she may be seen as the mother goddess creation archetype since she has no actual roots within the ground but merely is representative of the spark of life is debatable,⁹² but it is not accidental that Joyce writes her as such. Nor is it coincidental that her metaphor as being a tree/leaf is in reference to the night which had begun the outset of the washerwomen’s tale. The creation began at night; the city awakes at dawn when Anna Livia retreats into the river. Joyce had noted earlier that this is “zero hour” (FW 403.20) – the beginning and end of all things when the collision of contraries comes to a head. Here Anna Livia reverts back to the form of water retreating away removing the impetus for these oppositional forces to even exist.

It therefore may be concluded that, among all the events, ALP comes to the fore as the spark of creation giving life to all and is the constant basis for Dublin to arise. Although she can remain a constant, “a symbol of unchanging” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14), in which “Anna was, Livia is, Plurabelle’s to be” (FW 215.24)⁹³ for eternity, the *terra firma* of the novel has been static, a constant reimagining of itself as under the influence of her *coniunctio* HCE. “[H]er lord, like all men, is capable of assuming many forms” (Burgess, *A Shorter FW* 14). The female principle dissolved into initials and then into the landscape has become water, one of the primary substances of ancient thought, surrendering to the purity of the reunion between daughter and father as the Liffey finds rest in the sea. Water, as the eternal substance from which life springs

⁹² Burgess is more literal in his approach and claims that this is dual layered, more directly aiming at telling the sleeping husband to wake up as she is to be off: “She is the leaves of the tree of the life, now falling; she is any wife telling any husband ... to get out of bed and start a new day. But, as the monologue develops, the river colours everything” (*ReJoyce* 335). Here, Burgess shows that even a literal interpretation accentuates the dynamic nature of the text basing itself on the everyday but trying to become a *mythos*.

⁹³ Joyce may be using this description of ALP as based on a popular Limerick of the time to describe Dublin “Limerick was – Dublin is – Cork will be / The greatest city of the three” (Marshall n.pag.), thereby more closely linking the use of ALP as symbolic of the Irish city as an eternal metaphor for those who would be in the know.

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

forth, the life itself varies, but the substance remains eternal and it is hers to destroy. Symbolically, as the water which comes in and out of the shore to the land to create, it also may end. Burgess terms this as the “the mystery of the river” since “it is from the river’s death in the sea that the reality of new birth in the hills ... is derived for ever and ever” (*A Shorter FW* 14). As examined from the purported cyclical historical view of Vico, the *ricorso* in its conjunction with the beginning as what has been created retreats into nothing; as examined from a cyclical mythic view, the end occurs only for a new beginning. Despite the end and beginning, the spark of existence still occurs as a result from the coming and going of the source of the divine splitting and reemerging with itself. Anna Livia’s surrender to the sea stands for this duality of life’s commencement meeting with its cessation. Leading to and coming back to death, ultimately, her “union is not only with love but with death” (Ellmann, *JJ* 253).

Finding fault with a lack of an ending or, for that matter, a beginning, is hard to apply to a novel which, for all intents and purposes, re-circles on itself removing the need to have either. The trick or twist of the novel is too readily reliable for the literary criticism of the work to be based on as well since it does not necessarily answer all or any questions of the work’s complexity, especially since there is no basis to think of it as being the same as a linear circle which has all the events repeating over and over again. Instead, based upon the ideas of *ricorso* and the cyclic nature of myth, it may be interpreted that Joyce was trying to tell a tale of a life that all individuals go through in their own way but here was presented in its own particular manner. It would then follow that the essential concept thereof is that the tale of *Finnegans Wake* is timeless, having no past, present, or future, but always occurring as in the original cyclic form of myth presented by Eliade which all go through – meaning no past leading to the present, no future from it, just the “now”. This claim can actually be found within the text proper, claiming that “Finnegan” is a totality which nothing new or old comes from,⁹⁴ ultimately expressed as, “[I]f there is a future in every past that is present” (*FW* 496.36-37). Such an explanation would account well for Joyce’s own reflection on the work, where he states that “a great part of every human experience is passed in a state which cannot be rendered sensible by the use of wideawake language, cut and dry grammar and goahead plot” (*Letters III* 146, qtd. in Fargnoli and Gillespie, *Critical Companion* 49). If this was at least partially his aim, the disjoint of the

⁹⁴ *Quis est qui novir quinnigan* and *Qui quae quot at Quinigan’s Quake!* (*FW* 496.36-37, 497.1)

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

novel's style at least may be accounted for. The birth, living, and death of life is hard to describe in a non-mythic form for the individual level of the ego to ascribe itself to, to reflect on and find oneself in. The ego or persona blinds the self to seeing the overall picture, assigning its own peculiarities as being essential to its existence and the same experience as unequivocal for all. By writing in purely mythic, archetypal form, despite its extreme difficulty, *Finnegans Wake* aims to leave your ego at the door to see the overall picture of the self as being at once whole and divided against itself. Therein, instead of being merely cyclic in the limited perceptive form of an end precipitating a beginning, it should be read as many parts differentiating themselves only to be part of one whole or as one dividing into two and to totalize the sum, two must become three, but all are one in the same instance.

Upon the basis of this interpretation, the ending may be read entirely anew. When ALP professes, "End here. Us then, Finn, again! Take. Bussoftlhee, mememormee! Till thousandsthee. Lps. The keys to. Given! A way a lone a last a loved a long the" (FW 628. 13-16), it may be seen as the Jungian self coming to a whole. This would be in line with Joyce's love of epiphany. It would be out of character for his characters to suddenly not gain this moment of realization, especially at the "conclusion". The key alluded to has no real reference in the novel. Unlike the letter, no one is searching for keys, *per se*. Yet, the object of the key is to open and close a door. When the key is in the lock, the action of closing or opening reaches its maximum potential. Joyce might have not meant this, but it may be interpolated from the text. Therein, when the *ricorso* does happen, it is the moment of highest potential and destruction; when the self is recognized, it is also the highest moment of potential and destruction for the individual, as has been seen in the analysis of *A Portrait* and *Ulysses*. Fin Fordham characterized the *Wake* as being "a gigantic epiphany of mankind; an ark to all contain all human myths and types; a cosmos of Alle; a polyhedron of scripture" (n.pag.). Perhaps then, the nature of the text is to have the individual recognize the self, the sum of all parts, which has neither end nor beginning as well.

6.3. The Fascination with Joycean Proliferation of the Figuration of Enumeration and its Unification

It would seem to be an overstatement that the simpler the text, the more singular its interpretation; *Finnegans Wake* is anything but simple. When a respected author such as Chabon questions the value of reading it, among many others, there is wisdom within that sentiment as it is written to be almost incomprehensible. Itself a gestation of seventeen years probably played no small part in establishing its difficulty as a text. Yet, in spite of its very real challenges, it *is* read, which means that it must be doing something right. In short, *Finnegans Wake* is prone to being analyzed in any which way that can be justified based on the interpretation of the reading, as long as there is a basis for it within the text. Jungian and archetypal analysis as well as examining it from a mythic standpoint is but one more clarification to its pages, but not the only. Platt sums it up best to the reader, claiming that instead of having little meaning or no meaning at all, “[T]he typical condition of the *Wake* is rather that it has over meaning, too many competing possibilities which run entirely counter to expectations raised by the will to knowledge, equally so characteristic of the *Wake*” (126). Notwithstanding this sentiment, perhaps therein lies the genius and the beauty as Joyce had written an encompassing work that aimed to swallow the history of literature into its folds. The “competing possibilities” are the exact point of the novel – to make comprehensive the extensive incomprehensible nature of literature by retreating to its roots stylistically and narratively. Through a litany of reciting and returning to essential points of archetypal oppositions, Joyce creates readable characters in spite of its frustrations.

The language used itself is not half of what drives one to madness when delving into the *Wake* (or perhaps even the latter sections of *Ulysses*), but it is certainly the means by which confusion arises. Unlike reading a book from pre-standardized spelling in which the gist of the matter can be gained quite readily, *Finnegans Wake* without close examination is utterly absurd but not meaningless. This is due to the fact that Joyce aimed to write it in a style that went against “wide awake language”. Albeit one should not accept the statements of the author as the final word on the matter, Joyce stated that “we must write dangerously: everything is inclined to flux and change nowadays and modern literature, to be veiled, must express that flux” (Power 75). The “flux” is well represented in the *Wake*, as evidenced by the free form of flow which

*A CYCLIC RETELLING OF THE TALE:
ARCHETYPAL OPPOSITES IN FINNEGANS WAKE*

occurs on every page. Yet, the style is that of the two washerwomen talking, the confessional dream state of the brothers, the husband and wife bickering – a spoken style. The very attempt to challenge traditional canons and to constitute long works in the style of the lyric form of the past, meant always to be heard and not necessarily read is one of the aspects of *Finnegans Wake* that make it a daunting read. While the art of prose had long taken root far before Joyce's time, despite his own innovativeness in writing down the spoken word of Dublin within the *Wake*, the modern reader exists in a purely prosaic form of prose in which the words on the page had better spell out the meaning and events given. The boiler plate detective novel or romance will tell exactly what is happening, either directly or indirectly, even what the characters feel and why. Except when written badly, no one has trouble reading them and most criticism of them comes in the form of reviews as to whether they are worth the read. The *Wake* goes far beyond these works. No narrator, no set characters, a setting that comes in and out of existence as much as all do within the novel. Based upon this loose assemblage, how is it then to be understood without these?

Joyce used archetypal means in all of his works, particularly in employing them through a rhythm of multiple symbolizations focusing on a limited aim at hand. In the *Wake*, he uses broad archetypes to recreate a numerous reoccurrence of one long conversation between two halves separating and becoming whole again, concentrating on typical symbols and motifs to illuminate a change in narrative as “individual myths and societal world views to a more all-encompassing and primordial philosophy” (DiBernard, *Alchemy and FW* 35). Therefore, based upon the mythic structure used, it does bear the semblance of a full narrative but, certainly, not a traditional one. By breaking the narrative down to its components, by having it written in a lyric style that allows for multiple allusions and references on one theme, the work substantially challenges the boundaries of what a novel may be, even today. This is the best answer one can proffer when posing the question of why to read *Finnegans Wake*.

7. Epilogue: Concluding Thoughts on Archetypal Criticism and Joyce

Through examining Joyce's works of prose in a thoroughly detailed manner, an argument has been both directly and indirectly established that these works may be better understood, indeed more accessibly read, when the principles of applying archetypes and motifs, as well as their related symbols, are incorporated into the reading. Moreover, it has shown repeatedly that Joyce drew upon these same in order to craft not only the overall narrative structure and character, but individual instances of where units of symbolism has been utilized to underscore areas within the text to the overall theme.

The stories of *Dubliners* first demonstrate that a theme of paralysis is made through symbolism that repeats from each of the fifteen stories. Although a limited sample has been taken for analysis, it has also been readily seen that the *gnomon* was used as a structural means and narrative symptom upon which Joyce places the context of the stories for the reader to arrive at the outcome of the conclusion without resorting to a direct statement. This same principle has been applied to Joyce's theory of epiphany in *A Portrait*, illuminating how Joyce takes a series of discordant but coherently corresponding objects as well as events to combine into a whole that leads to revelation which propels the character through an arc of individuation and transformation. The epiphanies themselves are also buttressed by repeated usage of symbolism dotted throughout the areas of text to enrich the narrative itself as determined by the setting's theme. Joyce does not break from this concept in *Ulysses*, but probes further, abandoning the semi-traditional style of narration to resort to an extreme usage of stream of conscious, in which all the thoughts become sign and symbols against which the text and its plot may be compared and studied. Albeit it is not claimed here that Joyce intentionally used these motifs as a means to plan out the narrative in the sense of starting from only this point in its crafting, he did write an epic for the modern age based upon the overall archetypal experience of the *hero's journey*. As a jumping off point of the extreme employment of archetype underscoring thematic representation, Joyce created a purely mythic tale of *Finnegans Wake* in which he was able to resort to a base repetitive pattern of only using the essential elements of storytelling.

Propp was the quintessential structuralist, claiming that all fairy tales must fit a theme and include essential elements, the basis of all structuralist analysis which this work has tried to

stay away from, although it has incorporated elements of it. However, there is some wisdom in the sense that corresponding basic elements must be found in a narrative to establish a formula on which storytelling may be carried out. Nabokov was of the sentiment that “great novels are great fairy tales” (2), but he was so on the assertion that the everyday needs to be transformed into the “magical”. Joyce followed both the rule of using standardized structures as well as transforming the conventional into mythic constructs within his own works, relying on the specific forms of the former to accomplish the latter.

While this dissertation has striven to paint a picture of how Joyce may be better understood through applying archetypal and mythological criticism and has pointed out specific correlations and parallels between theory and text relevant to the hypothesis, the question remains as to why and for what reason this is worthy of inspection. The answer is that examining Joyce’s works from this standpoint allows for a “deconstruction” of the style of his writing which results in better location and placement of the importance of the individual units he uses within it to create a comprehensive entity of writing. Namely, his writing may be classified into using archetype, motif, and symbols as to achieve an end objective of creating an extraordinary tale out of the ordinary presented.

This dissertation has shown in its section on *Dubliners* that Joyce approached the writing of Dublin as giving it a physical form in a detailed setting by a direct means which incorporated the “trash heaps” of the city as painted in a pallid brown as well as characteristics of it that are dwelled on in the text. Noon is even of the opinion that this fact of detailed realism in its descriptions distinguishes Joyce’s works as “no modern capital has been so completely ‘given ... to the world’ as Dublin” (“Unfacts, Fiction, and Facts” 254). In realistic overtones, Joyce set Dublin to incorporate minute instances that fit an umbrella motif he was touching upon as to ascribe both arc and setting. In “An Encounter”, which was not discussed in length here but mentioned, Joyce opens the story with a narrator recalling a love of adventure novels, specifically Westerns. The Western has the motif of adventurers encountering new lands and people which had been unknown before. Joyce then writes out an adventure for the boys of the story in which they are surprised to see sailors or the commonplace people and areas of a Dublin that they already live in. Joyce dwells on the sudden impression of a Norwegian boat while merely crossing the sound on a ferry. These may seem minor details but when placed against of the motif of the narrative of young adventure (which goes awry) Joyce has used these mere

instances of mention to fully ground the sense of adventure where all these items are new for the children. While this may be essential to every narrative by any renowned author, Joyce has done here something remarkable in its own right. He has taken the mere objects that could have been typically seen on a daily basis in life and has elevated them to fitting an archetype without having to make them grandiose. By employing the construct of the common along with the everyman in his writings as a bridge between the archetypal motifs, Joyce writes layered texts that can appeal on multiple levels. In effect, this allows the reader to be transplanted into the setting of the story while still being independent of it and being able to relate to the work by recognizing the familiar in the extraordinary.

Joyce was not pretentious in his writings. Despite the perplexing prose or the references particular to the period that need annotation to grasp, Joyce does not set a barrier between these aspects of life and writing. He has no need to aggrandize the common, but let its placement within the narrative speak for itself by aptly incorporating actual instances of realism that balance against the motif of the story. Joyce need not mention why an object is important as it is already symbolized within the total line of the narrative's action, usually referencing a character arc. If anything, this makes his works both approachable and modern to the reader, unlike a more readable author such as Dickens or a writer of the Victorian period who, according to his or her style, may reference exactly what is meant by the symbol used either directly or indirectly.

To return to *Dubliners*, "The Dead" has a whole two paragraphs describing the food at the party. This should seem out of place since it is an annual event the contemporary reader would have been familiar with, as well as it is not a diatribe on eating. Yet, when the aunts of Gabriel and the decline of Dublin are mentioned, the description of the meal stands in stark contrast. The traditions of the old way of life in Dublin have seemed to have died out, but the aunts in their old age have maintained them, even alluding several times to the fact that the party would cease with them. In addition to serving as a breaking point within the three sections of the story, it allows for the narrative to transition into a motif of decline and age as contrasted to the plenty of the table. Moreover, Joyce repetitious use paints a banquet through multiple mentions to a point of overindulgence. This is but one instance in which Joyce utilizes the ordinary to create an extraordinary sense of its symbolism within the narrative.

As has been demonstrated in this doctorate, Joyce employed such instances of repeating symbols as a means to highlight the motifs presented within the text. Although this originates

with the *gnomon* of *Dubliners*, as that which is recognized but not seen, it travels into his other works as well.

In reviewing of Joyce's *Portrait*, it has been indicated that Joyce writes a novel that explains the emergence of an artist, particularly how the artist finally comes to revelation about his character through a final understanding of how he views the world. Joyce used epiphany as a means to compel the protagonist along his character arc. However, as has been described in length, Joyce utilized the objects encountered within the everyday occurrences of Stephen Dedalus to transfer the character from one step of realization to another. Joyce again relies on having his words speak for the motif through symbolism. When Stephen is punished, a dialogue is used to open the event where the boys discuss just and unjust punishment before the punishment even occurs or even before the reader knows it is about to occur. Joyce has this dialogue included in order to set a tone for the upcoming motif by going over what a punishment is and then has a childish Stephen repeat back to himself what is against the Church and not as he has been taught. This dialogue and inner monologue response is utilized to contrast and foreshadow the event of his unjust punishment. Just as prior to this event entirely, the dialogue of Christmas dinner and Stephen's reflection on it underscore the childish innocence of the character and the blind punishment of the Church which is to come. By doing this in a non-explicit manner, Joyce weaves a rich tapestry that allows for the arc and epiphany to shine through by merely focusing on the ideas presented. For this reason, the aesthetic concept provided within *A Portrait* is utterly crucial as Joyce was writing for these events to layer upon one another and be seen within three different categories of *integritas*, *consonantia*, and *claritas*. In this manner, Joyce is able to take "glasses", for this first epiphany, and make them a symbol of a struggle that has undertones of the deeper conflict of Stephen *versus* the control of society/the church. All epiphanies follow suit transforming the character through a sermon, sexual experience, his name, a bathing girl, and other such instances that give impetus to the character arc. Moreover, even after Stephen reaches self-knowledge as an artist, symbols are still used to support the struggle he has coming to this self-knowledge *versus* society, as shown in the dialogue he uses to justify himself where a student organization symbolizes radical Dublin or an English professor stands for aesthetic appreciation.

Using these epiphanies to account for Stephen's character development is reminiscent of Jung's reflection on the problem of interpreting the creative process: "In the first instance the

object of analysis and interpretation is a concrete artistic achievement, while in the second it is the creative human being as a unique personality. Although these two objects are intimately related and even interdependent, neither of them can explain the other” (86; vol. 15). Joyce partially circumvents this conundrum by having Stephen’s achievements create an increasingly complex character, whose uniqueness stems from the same. However, Jung’s positing of this enigma speaks to Joyce’s works as one may be tempted also to ask how much of Joyce invested of himself into his works and why they should be so striking.

While Jung points out that “the poet will turn to mythological figures in order to give suitable expression to his experience” (96; vol. 15) he also implicitly states that no other form of art can exist other than that which is derived from the collective unconscious and can only be shaped by the structures arising from it. Therefore, when the creation of art, including writing is the matter of discussion, one must not forget that according to Jung “the primordial experience is the source of his [the artist’s] creativeness, but it is so dark and amorphous that it requires the related mythological imagery to give it a form” (96; vol. 15). When this fact is taken into account, it may be asserted that Joyce took the world of his life,⁹⁵ whether it was autobiographical or not, and elevated it to the same forms found arising from the eternal myths originating in the collective unconscious.

Since Joyce does not merely write of his life but tries to reimagine it as one form among many where he codifies essential ideas into his narrative, he fulfills Nabokov’s statement that the “reinventing of the world” (2) is the hallmark of excellent writing; i.e., the author must recreate an entirely new world which the reader can access and recognize as his or her own. The concept of Joyce’s style precisely has this as its aim: to recreate the world along archetypal structures that are able to transfer stories unique on the individual level to a mythic representation seen through

⁹⁵ In a letter to his brother Stanislaus (whom Joyce considered to be the only member of his family who was, in some ways, able to understand him as well as the supposed Shaun to his Shem), Joyce stated: “Yet I have certain ideas I would like to give form to: not as doctrine but as the continuation of the expression of myself” (qtd. in Ellmann, *JJ* 240). While this statement might seem to strengthen the argument that Joyce was writing his works as an extension of himself thereby weakening the suggestion that his works are developed as strictly controlled narratives that are reliant purely on archetypal structures, this is not the case. True, he did express this desire as ‘an expression of himself’, but this does not mean he was writing a fictional autobiography. It is the first section of the statement that he ‘has certain ideas’ which proves illuminating to Joyce’s aims as author as he had the idea of the story’s construction prior to writing it in which he wanted to include parts of himself, not the other way around. For instance, the fictional father Simon Dedalus, according to Stanislaus’ letters, is related to Joyce’s own, found in “the father’s hopeless drunkenness” (Noon, “Unfacts, Fiction, and Facts” 259). However, Joyce’s father, John Joyce, is a contributing factor to the father as an archetype and not the singular template for the character. Indeed, Simon is the archetype of all absentee fathers, whose characteristics can be found in any story or life, including Joyce’s.

archetypes that are also relatable. Therein, the reutilization of archtexts in *Ulysses* aids to the elevating the ordinary events of approximately eighteen hours into a life changing experience since it draws on a basis of archetypes found in epic literature to achieve this end. Chase concludes the same when examining the relation of myth and literature in general, stating that “[M]yth is magic literature, literature which achieves the wonderful, uncanny, or brilliant reality of the magical vision of things” (47). Joyce’s repurposing of myth succeeds in accomplishing the same of establishing a magic, reinvented world based on mythic structures.

As regards to the idea of how much of Joyce’s own experiences are in these works, a majority of modern novels can be partly traced to the author’s life. This concept emerged in no small part through assigning a history to the object to inscribe significance to it, as has been the mark of the Hegelian or Marxian schools of criticism. While the creation does arise first within the artist, there is no need to assign the author’s history to the novel to gain an understanding of it, especially as concerns Jungian analysis. What is more important is that the form taken in the interpretation of the events fits a mode that must be told in a manner as prescribed by the structures of the collective unconscious that give birth to artistic creation. Joyce taps into these structures to forge his works.

The reading of a novel in its historical and cultural context as opposed to how it fits into a universal structuring of narrative forms is a theoretical point of contention to the application of Jungian criticism. Whereas the latter permits a text to be structured within the total scope of human experience as relates to the literary structures as art, historical context limits the view as being inherent to one timeframe and place of reference. To illustrate as to the reason why this point needs elaborating, Schwarz claims that “[T]wentieth-century novels are often ... anxious, self-doubting ones. ... [They] are the process of transforming life into art. ... The author’s struggle with his or her subject becomes a major determinant of the novel form” (20-21). Joyce’s novels certainly fall into this category of writing down the struggle of uncertainty that seemed to be the zeitgeist of the latter 19th and pre-World War Two literary environment, but this would be exceeding the standpoint of Jungian/archetypal analysis offered here to reach a biographical analysis of Joyce which is not the aim of the dissertation. Perhaps then, instead of insisting that the author is the cause of the uncertainty as originated by the age in which the author lives, it should perhaps be claimed that the author is writing tales of uncertainty that are by themselves eternal since they are written based upon supporting motifs which happen to be placed against a

mirror of uncertainty at the time. This claim is only made here to suggest that the historical analysis of a work against the creation of it is not as important as the work's ability to manifest the archetypal structures familiar to the human mind within the text. Joyce's fictional prose does condense elements to its base forms, but matches arcs of development within the plot and character that fit these same archetypes. Moreover, by enriching archetypal constructs, Joyce is able to compose narratives that have inter-dependent archetypal symbolism which repurpose the actual and reinvent it into the "mythical".

This doctorate has delved into Joyce's life when it has proved relevant, but it has only done so in accordance with the proposed theoretical and methodological background offered. The latter two novels of Joyce's career do not speak to the same extent in favour of biographically sourcing bases for criticism and analysis as much as *A Portrait* proves fruitful in drawing out synchronicities between fiction and non-fiction. Indeed, *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* cannot be read as purely based on Joyce's life; doing so, limits the purview of them as literary works as well as their understanding. The distancing alone of Joyce's own life to these latter works is also recognized by literary critics. Even if Noon notes that "*Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* are as deeply autobiographical ... their tone is less confessional" ("Unfacts, Fiction, and Facts" 256). The reason behind this self-limitation of utilizing Joyce's life is due to the factor that while a certain substrate of the works may be brought to light when using factoids of Joyce's life, it is clutching at straws when approaching his last two novels. The concept of an absentee father does not suffice to explain *Ulysses* as much as describing the epiphany the novel culminates in which is slowly unravelled throughout the work. In fact, the symbolization is entirely lost as well as its style when focusing on the story as being pertinent to explaining Joyce's life. It should be the other way round, in which Joyce transformed his own experience and blended it with the archetypes he was trying to express.

Theoretically, Jungian psychology typically divides the timespan of one's development according to the differing ages one goes through in life as they progress. On this foundation, Campbell deemed that myths represent these same stages and that all myths follow one form that varies, particularly for heroic myths as representing life. In this regard, Joyce's life may also be compared as the primary influence of his writing as well. However, ascribing the *monomyth* of the *hero's journey* to either biography or fiction can be a curse in disguise for the analyst as well as a blessing. Campbell was an exceptionally open advocate of myth as a means to provide life

with significance as the stories that are created out of the collective unconscious are judged to be, in Campbell's own terms, equivalent to one another as concerns the subject matter of which they speak. In this regard, the tale of growing up or finding oneself is the same no matter what form it takes, as this dissertation has pointed out repeatedly. Yet, here lies the fault with associating biography with fiction as even the individual's personal story is meant to relate to the hero's journey. Campbell was quite insistent on the fact that the myth was a device created to symbolize the mark of change on the individual. The mind mired in the collective unconscious therefore gave rise to the myth and not the opposite. It is therefore risky to associate Joyce's own life to the hero's journey he created since direct parallels must be made. However, it is not a jump in logic to say that Joyce was so skilled the writer and storyteller that he was able to recognize the common theme of the protagonist's transformation that branches throughout all stories. Whether consciously or unconsciously aware of the fact is of no matter, but the fact that he was able to exploit the archetypes found in classic protagonist development to the extent found within the works is a testament to Joyce's ability to recognize the essential natures of storytelling.

Analysing *Ulysses* from the standpoint of the monomyth allows for its arcane nature to be clarified and remove pretension from its interpretation. For instance, when holding the "Nausicaa" chapter up to the light of the monomyth, the incident of the story, especially of Bloom's sexual self-stimulation, loses the otherwise vulgar interpretations pertaining to it and takes on an entirely richer meaning. Bloom is looking constantly for strength to return home, to a reformed and empowered self. When on the shores of the beach, the same Stephen had been on at the outset of the novel, he sees across the way a woman who willingly entices him. By engaging in a distanced sexual act, Bloom's arc takes on a positive turn in which he is more empowered over his own actions. The young woman symbolizes, according to the monomyth interpretation, supernatural assistance which helps the protagonist achieve a final aim. Since Joyce has tied Bloom's self-imposed (sexual) impotence with the loss of his son, this event is highly significant to signal that the character has transformed and only after can he extend his own help to Stephen. Through this vantage point of analysis, Joyce's works gain the understanding they need which is the benefit of applying archetypal criticism to them as breaking down archetypes removes the confusing symbolism in context and leaves the essence of the narrative to be seen.

Following this conclusion, in order to gain insight into Joyce's work, the theoretical basis of Jungian psychology has never been used here to analyse the mind of Joyce, but to provide both a framework and a background against which the works may be approached and interpreted. In line with the proclamations of "Get yourself psychoanalised!" (FW 522.31-32) or "I can psoakoonaloose myself any time I want" (FW 522.34-35), this dissertation has not sought out to express an analysis of Joyce's psyche, but of the concept of Jung's psychology grounded in the ideas of the self and the collective unconscious thereof. Jung suggested that "[T]he investigation of the psyche should ... be able on the one hand to explain the psychological structure of a work of art, and on the other to reveal the factors that make a person artistically creative" (86; vol. 15). This research has not chosen the latter, but rather the former as to disassemble Joyce's works into the structures which they follow, particularly on base elements of motif and archetypes as they give shape to narrative. When the self has been discussed, it has been used as a way to provide direct terms to conflicting and complimentary archetypes that the narrative depends on. Therefore, anima and animus, conscious and unconscious, integral elements of the self, have been terms to show the resolution of conflict within the narrative/character.

The use of archetype as the basis of Jungian psychology has been a fruitful means to clarify Joyce's writing as well. It may be claimed that Joyce founded his works on such usage. In fact, *Ulysses* can even be a gauge by which Joyce as an author may be seen gradually breaking away from traditional narrative forms into elemental archetypal structures on which *Finnegans Wake* is entirely organized. This fact is evident from comparing the first to last chapters of *Ulysses*. Whereas the novel opens with a few chapters in which the dialogues and descriptions are reminiscent of *A Portrait*, with strong allusions based on individual symbols, these traditional forms give way by the end of the novel. Specifically, the point of departure can be located in the "Cyclops" chapter where there is a cleaving between experimental and standard forms of narration. What is more, for the "Oxen of the Sun", it serves not only as a promise of a new born life which foreshadows the later conclusion, but Joyce uses section by section as an allegory to the development of English literature as well as a harmonization between the faults of both protagonists, Bloom and Stephen.

Finnegans Wake does away with all pretences of the conventional novel, which had already been abandoned in *Ulysses* with Molly's soliloquy. Joyce chooses to reduce the narrative to fundamental elements that focus on a circular retelling of a single narrative and conflict.

Instead of the semi-prose of *Ulysses*, Joyce opts to tell a “myth” through the squabbles of a family as it is a means by which the narrative may be expressed and read. Overtones of family relationships were more direct in ancient myths where there was a literal pantheon of gods who were all related to one another, generationally or as siblings. Joyce writes *Finnegans Wake* in the same vein, where the rivalry of brother against brother and father against mother shape the creation of life. Therefore, “the violent quarrels and shocking accusations that become increasingly frequent among the members of this large family” (Noon, “Unfacts, Fiction, and Facts” 259) are not written as being real fights but as ones in a motif. If approached in this manner, the work becomes far clearer, and when viewed as a tale of real events, the narrative becomes vastly incomprehensible to the reader.

This dissertation has gone in depth to discuss the symbolic nature that the archetype figures in *Finnegans Wake* take on in order to represent antagonizing forces that work off one another to accomplish overall story structure. Joyce’s curtailing of the traditional elements requires that pairs be formed that represent one another as well as associations between them as branches of one, singular entity. Issy, the daughter of HCE and ALP, though not discussed within the text, is an anima who appears in the novel and takes on the role of temptress as an extension of ALP. Her “character”, as opposed to the overwhelming aspect of nurturer or life giver of ALP, is written as one of sexual natures and affections which men compete for, not least of which are her brothers. This is the corresponding nature of sexuality minus the fertility that Issy gives, similar to the two-sided forms of Shem and Shaun. Read through such an analysis, it grows clearer that her character can be better understood, but only through examining archetypes as they occur interdependently to one another, as has been the centerpiece of this dissertation for all of Joyce’s’ works.

Naturally, this research has only touched upon the breadth and depth of Joyce’s fiction as may be interpreted through archetypal criticism. In future, a more thorough analysis should take selected individual sections of his work in order to combine them with detailed annotations that relate to the references of other works either utilized or may be read from the text. This doctorate has chosen to examine Joyce’s use of archetype in broad strokes since it is essential to understanding his work, but this has not resulted in the numerous classification of archetypes throughout all of his works for their every instance. A distinctly fundamental listing of archetypes in this nature would lend to further parallels that would extend to further archetypal

approaches. It would also be valuable for academic purposes to catalogue archetype usage specific to Joyce to make a reference of corresponding motifs that only he uses not in relation to external works. Given that parallels do run between his narratives, doing so would provide a higher construct to examine the oeuvre as whole and the reoccurring patterns of narrative style he returned to through his literary career.

Many find Joyce's works to be more trouble than are worth. It seems it is partly the job of the academic to make them not appear so. McCourt argued that by examining Joyce's work through a lens that allowed the reader to see the broad categories of multifaceted elements that Joyce used, he was more human as a writer and, for that reason, less daunting. This dissertation agrees, but adds that understanding Joyce through the archetypal means by which his works are written and easily understandable makes the literary giant "a little less original and God-like" (McCourt xvi). Since Joyce's style of writing employs motifs that are the groundwork for all narratives, the works themselves prove to be relatable and readable despite the pomp and circumstance given to them. This itself is a mark of Joyce's genius as he was able to forge literature that enshrined conventional narratives of the modernist period, in a novel style unto its own, that nonetheless are able to draw the reader in by appealing to the essential elements of storytelling and building on their complexity.

WORKS CITED

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

a. James Joyce's Works

Joyce, James. *Dubliners*. Dover Publication, Inc., 1991. Print.

---. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Penguin Books, 1996. Print.

---. *Ulysses*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2010. Print.

---. *Finnegans Wake*. Oxford: OUP, 2012. Print.

b. Other Primary Sources

Joyce, James. *Collected Poems*. Read Book Design, 2014. PDF file.

---. *Exiles*. B.W. Huebsch Publishing, 1918. PDF file.

---. *Stephen Hero*. Edited from the Manuscript in the Harvard College, Library by Theodore Spencer. Incorporating Additional Manuscript Pages in the Yale University Library and the Cornell University Library. Edited by John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon. New Directions Press, 1944. Print.

2. GENERAL THEORETICAL STUDIES AND CRITICAL ARTICLES

a. Jungian Psychology, Psychological and Archetypal Studies

Douglas, Claire. "The Historical Context of Analytical Psychology." *Cambridge Companion To Jung*. Edited By Polly Young-Eisendrath and Terence Dawson. Cambridge UP, 2008, pp. 19-39. PDF file.

Edinger, Edward F. *Ego & Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche*. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books Inc., 1973. Print.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. With a Foreword by Harold Bloom. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 1990. Print.

- . "The Archetypes of Literature." *Fables of Identity* by Northrop Frye, 1963. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1951. PDF file.
- Guerin, Wilfred L. et al. "Mythological and Archetypal Approaches" in *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. Oxford UP, 2005, pp. 182-221. Print.
- . "Feminism and Psychoanalysis" in *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. 5th edition. Oxford UP, 2005, pp. 227-231. Print.
- Jacobi, Jolande. *Complex/Archetype/Symbol in the Psychology of C. G. Jung*. Translated from the German by Ralph Manheim. Princeton UP, 1959. Print.
- . "The Practical Application of Jung's Theory." *The Psychology of C.G. Jung*. Translated by Ralph Manheim from the German. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1968, pp. 60-151. Print.
- Jung, Carl G., et al. *Man and his Symbols*. Anchor Press, 1988. Print.
- Jung, Carl G., and Aniela Jaffé. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. London: Fontana Press, 1995. Print.
- Jung, Carl G., and Carl Kerényi. *Essays on a Science of Mythology: The Myth of the Divine Child and the Mysteries of Eleusis*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969. Print.
- Jung, Carl G. "The Meaning of Self-knowledge" in *The Undiscovered Self*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002, pp. 75-79. Print.
- . "The Practical Use of Dream-Analysis" in *Dreams*. MJF Books, 1974, pp. 87-111. Print.
- . *Four Archetypes: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- . *Psychological Types or The Psychology of Individuation*. Translated by H. Godwin Baynes. Vol. 6. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953. Print.
- . "On the Psychology of the Unconscious" in *Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 7. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1990, pp. 58-67. Print.
- . *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 8. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1991. Print.
- . *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconsciousness*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 9, pt. 1. London: Routledge, 1954. Print.

- . *Aion: Researches into The Phenomenology of the Self*. Vol. 9, pt. 2. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. New York: Pantheon Books Inc., 1959. Print.
- . "The philosophical tree." *Alchemical Studies*. Edited by Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull. Vol. 13. Princeton UP, 1967, pp. 283-285. Print.
- . *Mysterium Coniunctions: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 14. New York: Princeton UP, 1970. PDF file.
- . *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, 1978, vol. 15. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Princeton UP, 2013. Print.
- . "Psychology of the Transference." *The Practice of Psychotherapy: Essays on the Psychology of the Transference and Other Subjects*. Edited and Translated by Gerhard Adler and R.F.C. Hull. Vol. 16. Princeton UP, pp. 163-320, 1966. PDF file.
- . "Marriage as a Psychological Relationship." *The Development of Personality*. Edited and Translated by Gerhard Adler and R.F.C. Hull. Vol.17. Princeton UP, 1970, pp. 187-201. Print.
- Mattoon, Marry Ann. *Jung and the Human Psyche: An Understandable Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, 2007. Print.
- Neumann, Erich. *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype*. Princeton UP, 1974. Print.
- Ostrowki-Sachs, Margaret. "The Archetype of the Shadow." *From Conversations with C.G. Jung*. The C.G. Jung Institute Zürich, 1971. PDF file.
- Rank, Otto. *The Myth of the Birth of the Hero: A Psychological Interpretation of Mythology*. Authorized translation by drs. F. Robbins and Smith Ely Jelliffe. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1914. Print.
- Shugg, Richard P. *Jungian Literary Criticism*. Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1992. Print.

b. Mythological and Religious Studies

- Armstrong, Karen. *A Short History of Myth*. Canongate Books Ltd., 2008. PDF file.
- Campbell, Joseph, and Bill D. Moyers. *The Power of Myth*. New York: Anchor Books, 1991. Print.
- Campbell, Joseph. *The Mask of God: Oriental Mythology*. Vol. 2. London: Secker & Warburg, 1962. Print.

- . "The Legacy of Islam." *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology*. Vol. 3. Penguin Books, 1964, pp. 128-145. PDF file.
- . "The Love-Death." *The Mask of God: Creative Mythology*. Vol. 4. New York: Penguin Group, 1968, pp. 175-220. PDF file.
- . *Myths to Live by*. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1972. Print.
- . *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2004. Print.
- . *Pathways to Bliss: Mythology and Personal Transformation*. Edited by D. Kudler. Novato, California: New World Library, 2004. Print.
- Chase, Richard. "Myth as Literature" in *Literary Criticism and Myth*. Vol. 4. Edited with introductions by Robert A. Segal. New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1996. Print.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Edited and translated with an Introduction and Notes by Stephanie Dalley. Oxford UP, 2000. PDF file.
- Eliade, Mircea, and Northrop Frye. *Myths, Dreams, and Mysteries: The Encounter between Contemporary Faiths and Archaic Realities*. London: Collins, 1968. Print.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated from the French by Willard R. Trask. New York and London: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1959. Print.
- . *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated By Rosemary Sheed. Sheed and Ward Inc., 1958. Print.
- . *Rites and Symbols of Initiation*. Harper&Row, 1958. Print.
- . *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Translated from the French by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. Print.

c. Post-Structuralism and Intertextual Studies; Semiotics and Semiology

- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image, Music, Text*. Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath. London: FontanaPress, 1977. Print.
- Biedermann, Hans. *Dictionary of Symbolism: Cultural Icons and the Meanings Behind Them*. Translated by James Hulbert. Facts On File, Inc., 1992. Print.
- Cirlot, J. E. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. Translated from the Spanish by Jack Sage. Foreword by Herbert Read. London: Routledge, 1971. Print.

- Fowler, Alastair. *Literary Names: Personal Names in English Literature*. Oxford UP, 2012. PDF file.
- Juvan, Marko. *Intertekstualnost*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 2013. Print.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974). *The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. Edited by L. Burke, T. Crowley and A. Girvi. Routledge: London and New York, 2000. pp. 180-188. PDF file.
- . *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Margaret Waller, with an introduction by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia UP, 1984. PDF file.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis." *Écrits: A Selection*. Translated by Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 2002. Print.
- McAfee, Noëlle. "Semiotic and Symbolic." *Julia Kristeva*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004, pp. 16-29. Print.
- Propp, Vladimir. *The Morphology of the Folktale*. U of Texas P, 2009. PDF file.

3. SECONDARY SOURCES

a. Studies and Collections of Essays on James Joyce

- Beja, Morris. *Epiphany in the Modern Novel*. U of Washington P, 1971. Print.
- Begnal, Michael H. *Dreamscheme: Narrative and Voice in Finnegans Wake*. Syracuse UP, 1988. Print.
- Bishop, John. "'Anna Livia Plurabelle': A Riverbabble Primer." *Joyce's Book of the Dark: Finnegans Wake*. Wisconsin UP, 1986, pp. 336-385. PDF file.
- Bolt, Sydney. *A Preface to Joyce*. Longman, 1981. Print.
- Benstock, Bernard. *Joyce Again's Wake: An Analysis of Finnegans Wake*. Seattle and London: U of Washington P, 1965. Print.
- Bowker, Gordon. *James Joyce: A New Biography*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2012. EPUB file.
- Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. Oxford UP, 1989. Print.
- Burgess, Anthony. *ReJoyce*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1965. Print.
- . *A Shorter Finnegans Wake*. London: Faber & Faber Limited, 1973. Print.

- Campbell, Joseph and Henry M. Robinson. *A Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake: Unlocking James Joyce's Masterwork*. Edited and with a new forward by Edmund L. Epstein. Novato, California: New World Library, 2005. Print.
- Campbell, Joseph. *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words: On the Art of James Joyce*. New York: HarperColins Publishers, 1993. Print.
- Deming, Robert H. *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*. Vol. 1. London: Routledge; Kegan Paul, 1970. Print.
- DiBernard, Barbara. "As Above So Below and Death and Rebirth." *Alchemy and Finnegans Wake*. New York: State U of New York P, Albany, 1980, pp. 31-60. PDF file.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. 1959. New and Revisited Edition. Oxford UP, 1982. Print.
- . "James Joyce In and Out of Art." *Four Dubliners*. Washington: Library of Congress, 1986. Print.
- ., ed. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. A Viking Compass Book, 1975. Print.
- Fargnoli, Nicholas A. and Michael P. Gillespie. *Critical Companion to James Joyce: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. Infobase Publishing, 1996. Print.
- Fordham, Finn. "Introduction" in *Lots of Fun at Finnegans Wake: Unraveling Universals*. Oxford UP, 2007. PDF file.
- Gifford, Don. *Joyce Annotated*. U of California P, 1982. Print.
- Gilbert, Stuart, ed. *Letters of James Joyce*. New York: Viking Press, 1966. Print.
- Hutchins, Patricia. *James Joyce's World*. Routledge, 2016. PDF file.
- "James Joyce Reading His Work (1924/1929)". *The Public Domain Review*. 15 June 2012, n.pag., www.publicdomainreview.org/collections/james-joyce-reading-his-work-19241929/. Web. 15 May 2013.
- Kimball, Jean. *Odyssey of the Psyche: Jungian Patterns in Joyce's Ulysses*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1997. Print.
- Magalaner, Marvin and Richard M. Kain. *Joyce: The Man, the Work, the Reputation*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 1979. Print.
- McHugh, Roland. *Annotations to Finnegans Wake*. JHU Press, 2016. Print
- McKenna, Bernard. *James Joyce Ulysses: A Reference Guide*. London: Greenwood Press, 2002. Print.
- Nadel, Ira B. *Joyce and the Jews: Culture and Texts*. UP of Iowa, 1989. Print.

- Noon, William T. *Joyce and Aquinas*. Yale UP, 1970. Print.
- Norris, Margot. *Suspicious Readings of Joyce's Dubliners*. U of Pennsylvania P, 2003. Print.
- . "Finnegans Wake: The Critical Method." *James Joyce: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Edited by Mary T. Reynolds. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1993, pp. 163-170. Print.
- Peake, Charles. "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man." *James Joyce, the Citizen and the Artist*. Stanford UP, 1977, pp. 56-109. Print.
- Pelaschiar, Laura ed., *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Syracuse UP, 2015, pp vii-xiii. Print.
- Platt, Len. "Reading *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce: Texts and Contexts*. London and New York: Continuum, 2011, pp.103-130. Print.
- Reizbaum, Marilyn. *James Joyce's Judaic Other*. Stanford UP, 1999. Print.
- Sayeau, Michael. *Against the Event: The Everyday and the Evolution of Modern Narrative*. Oxford UP, 2013. Print.
- Schwarz, Daniel R. "Joyce's Ulysses: The Odyssey of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus on June 16, 1904." *Reading the Modern British and Irish Novel 1890-1930*. Blackwell Publishing, 2005, pp. 160-188. Print.
- Senn, Fritz. "Plausibility and Epimorphs." *Twenty-First Joyce*. Edited by M. Beja and E. C. Jones. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2004, pp. 239-58. Print.
- Spinks, Lee. *James Joyce: A Critical Guide*. Edinburgh UP, 2009. Print.
- Thurston, Luke. *James Joyce and the Problem of Psychoanalysis*. Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- Tindall, William York. *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce*. Thames and Hudson, 1959. Print.
- . *A Reader's Guide to Finnegans Wake*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1969. Print.

b. Selected Critical Reviews and Articles on James Joyce's Works

DUBLINERS

- Albert, Leonard. "Gnomonology: Joyce's 'The Sisters'." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 2, Winter, 1990, pp 353-364. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- Barberán Reinares, Laura. "Frankly Speaking, 'The men that is now is only all palaver and what they can get out of you': Migration and White Slavery in Argentina in Joyce's 'Eveline'."

- Irish Migration Studies in Latin America*, vol.8, no. 2, 2013, pp. 47-62. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- Benstock, Bernard, "The Dead". *Blooms Literary Themes*. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2009, pp. 47-58. Print.
- Dilworth, Thomas "Not 'Too Much Noise': Joyce's 'The Sisters' in Irish Catholic Perspective." *Twentieth Century Literature*, vol. 39, no. 1, 1993, pp. 99-112. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- Hobby, Blake. "Alienation in James Joyce's Dubliners." *Blooms Literary Themes*. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2009, pp. 61-69. Print.
- Scholes, Robert. "Semiotic Approaches to a Fictional Text: Joyce's 'Eveline'." *Foundational Essays in James Joyce Studies*. Edited by Michael Patrick Gillespie, UP of Florida, 2011, pp. 59-74. Print.
- Walzl, Florence L. "Joyce's 'The Sisters': a Development." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1973, pp. 375-421. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- . "Gabriel and Michael: The Conclusion of 'The Dead'." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 4, no. 1, Fall, 1966, pp. 17-31. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 10 July 2016.

STEPHEN HERO

Joyce, Stanislaus. *My Brother's Keeper*. Edited by Richard Ellmann. Viking Press, 1958. Print.

A PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG MAN

- Hendry, Irene. *Joyce's Epiphanies*. *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 54, pp. 449-467, 1946. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- Jacobs, Joshua. "Joyce's Epiphanic Mode: Material Language and the Representation of Sexuality in *Stephen Hero* and *Portrait*." *Blooms Literary Themes*. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2009, pp 135-151. Print.
- Knezevic, Borislav. "Is There a Class to Renounce in This Text? Gentlemanly Ideology in *A Portrait of the Artist*." *James Joyce in Trieste: An Album of Risky Readings*. Edited by Sebastian D. G. Knowles, Geert Lernout and John McCourt. Foreword by Renzo Crivelli. UP of Florida, 2002, pp. 159-170. Print.

- Riquelme, John Paul. "Stephen Hero and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*: transforming the nightmare of history." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. Edited by Derek Attridge. Cambridge UP, 2004, pp. 103-121. Print.
- Spencer, Theodore. "Introduction." *Stephen Hero*. Edited by John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon. New Directions Press, 1944, pp. 7-18. Print.
- Van Ghent, Dorothy. "On *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*." *Blooms Literary Themes*. Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. Infobase Publishing, 2009, pp. 167-181. Print.
- Walzl, Florence L. "The Liturgy of the Epiphany Season and the Epiphanies of Joyce." *PMLA*, vol. 80, pp. 436-450, 1965. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.

EXILES

- Restivo, Giuseppina. "Joyce's *Exiles* and Shakespeare's *Tempest*." *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Edited by Laura Pelaschiar. Syracuse UP, 2015, pp. 56-71. Print.

ULYSSES

- Cheng, Vincent J. "Stephen Dedalus and the Black Panther Vampire." *Jams Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1987, pp. 161-176. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 11 May 2017.
- Fuchs, Dieter. "He Puts Bohemia on the Seacoast and Make Ulysses Quote Aristotle': Shakespearean Gaps and the Early Modern Method of Analogy and Correspondence in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Joyce/Shakespeare*. Edited by Laura Pelaschiar. Syracuse UP, 2015, pp. 21-37. Print.
- Gurpagui Palacios, José Antonio. "An interview with Harold Bloom." *Revistas – Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, no. 9, 1996, pp. 165-181. PDF file.
- Levitt, Morton P. "'The Greatest Jew of All': James Joyce, Leopold Bloom and the Modernist Archetype." *Papers on Joyce*, 10/11 (2004-2005), pp. 143-62. www.siff.us.es/iberjoyce/papers-on-joyce/ Web. 29 Oct. 2014.
- Orem, William. "Corpse-Chewers: The Vampire in 'Ulysses'." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2011, pp. 57-72. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 20 Oct. 2015.
- Toynbee, Philip. "A Study of James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism*. Edited by Seon Givens. New York: Vanguard Press, 1948, pp. 243-284. Print.

- Wawrzycka, Jolanta. "Memory and Marital Dynamics in Ulysses." *Mediazioni*, no.16, *Rivista online del Dipartimento di Interpretazione e Traduzione (DIT) – Alma Mater Studiorum, Università di Bologna a Forlì*, 2014, pp. 1-20, www.mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it. Web. 15 Jun 2015.
- Williams, Bruce. "Molly Bloom: Archetype or Stereotype." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 33, no. 3, *Sexism in Family Studies*, Aug., 1971, pp. 545-546. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 29 Oct. 2014.

FINNEGANS WAKE

- Becket, Samuel. "Dante ... Bruno. Vico ... Joyce." *Our Exagmination Round his Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. Edited by Sylvia Beach. London: Faber and Faber, 1961. Web. 15 May 2014.
- Chabon, Michael. "What to Make of Finnegans Wake?" *The New York Review of Books*, July 12, 2012, pp. 1-12, www.nybooks.com/articles/2012/07/12/what-make-finnegans-wake/. Web. 15 May 2014.
- Knowles, Sebastian D. G. "Finnegans Wake for Dummies." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 1, Fall 2008, pp. 97-111. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 29 Oct. 2014.
- Quintelli-Neary, Marguerite. "Fenian Topography in 'Finnegans Wake'." *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua*, vol. 1, no. 4, Winter, 1997, pp. 93-103. University of St. Thomas (Center for Irish Studies). *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 24 Feb. 2016.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. "Joyce and Jolas: Late Modernism and Early." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 22, no. 2, *Joyce and the Joyceans* (1998-1999), pp. 245-252. Web. 17 May 2016.
- . "Narratology and the Subject of *Finnegans Wake*." *James Joyce: The Centennial Symposium*, ed. Morris Beja et al., U of Illinois P, 1986, pp. 137-149. PDF file.
- Wilson, Edmund. "The Dream of H. C. Earwicker." *Literary Essays and Reviews of the 1930s & 40s*. Edited by Lewis M. Dabney. New York: Library of America, 2007, pp. 438-457. PDF file.

c. General Reviews and Critical Articles on the Work of James Joyce

- Campbell, Joseph. "The Novels of James Joyce" in *Mythic Worlds, Modern Words: On the Art of James Joyce*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1993, pp. 5-19. Print.
- Eliot, T.S. "Ulysses, Order and Myth." *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage*. Vol. 1. Edited by Robert H. Deming. London: Routledge; Kegan Paul, 1970, 268-71. Print.
- McCourt, John. "Preface." *James Joyce in Context*. Edited by John McCourt. Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Noon, William T. "James Joyce: Unfacts, Fiction, and Facts." *Modern Language Association*, vol. 76, no. 3, June, 1961, pp. 254-276. *JSTOR Archive*. Web. 10 July 2015.
- Paunović, Zoran. Prevod, komentari i pogovor romanu *Uliks* Džejsma Džojsa. Beograd: Geopoetika, 2004. Print.

4. OTHER WORKS CITED

- Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri: Hell, Purgatory, Paradise*. Translated by Henry F. Cary, edited by Charles W. Eliot. New York: P.F. Collier & Son, 1909–14. PDF file.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas. *The Summa Theologica*. Literary Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1914. PDF file.
- Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Translated by R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye. PDF file.
- AVESTA: Vendidad* (English). Translated by James Darmesteter (From *Sacred Books of the East*, American Edition, 1898. *AVESTA:Vendidad Online*, 1995. www.avesta.org/vendidad/vd1sbe.htm).
- Euclid, "Elements Book 2: Fundamentals of Geometric Algebra." *Elements of Geometry*. Edited, and provided with a modern English translation, by Richard Fitzpatrick. 2008, pp. 49-69. PDF file.
- Colum, Mary. *Life and the Dream*. Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1947. *Google Books*. Web. 20 Aug. 2015.
- Gold, Herbert. *The Age of Happy Problems*. Transaction Publishers, 2002. Print.
- Herodotus. *The History*. Translated by George Rawlinson. The University of Adelaide, Book II. EPUB file.

- Homer. *The Odyssey*. Translated by Samuel Butler, 1920. Xist Publishing, 2015. *Google Books*. Web. 10 Mar. 2016.
- Jolas, Eugène. *Eugene Jolas: Critical Writings, 1924-1951*. Edited and with an introduction by Klaus H. Kiefer and Rainer Rumold. Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1999. PDF file.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. The University of Chicago Press, 2003, Print.
- Margaret Atwood, *The Penelopiad: The Myth of Penelope and Odysseus*. Canongate Books Inc., 2005. EPUB file.
- Marshall, John J., "The Beautiful City." *Popular Rhymes and Sayings of Ireland (1924)*. *Library Ireland: Irish books online*, 2005. www.libraryireland.com. Web. 15 June 2016.
- Montrose, Louis A. "Professing the Renaissance: the Poetics and Politics of Culture." *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. Edited by K. M. Newton. Macmillan Education, 1997, pp. 240-247. PDF file.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. "Good Readers and Good Writers" in *Lectures on Literature*. Edited by Fredson Bowers. Introduction by John Updike. New York: Harcourt Inc., 1980, pp. 1-9. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Translated and with a preface by Walter Kaufmann. Penguin Books, 1978. Print.
- . *Untimely Meditations*. Edited by Daniel Breazeale. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Translated by various authors. Published by Sir Samuel Garth. London: Printed for the proprietors of the English classics, by J. F. Dove, St. John's square, 1826. PDF file.
- P. Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphoses. Liber VIII. The Latin Library*. www.thelatinlibrary.com/ovid.html, Web. 25 Apr. 2016.
- Rahe, Paul Anthony. *Republics Ancient and Modern: The Ancient Régime in Classical Greece*. U of North Carolina P, 1994. PDF file.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Wordsworth Edition Limited, 1996. Print.
- The Holy Bible, King James Version*. Cambridge Edition, 1769. *King James Bible Online*, 2017. www.kingjamesbibleonline.org. Web. 14 Nov. 2016.

Vico, Giambattista. "Book One: Establishment of Principles." *The New Science*. Translated from the third edition (1744) by Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch. New York: Cornell UP, 1948, pp. 27-89. PDF file.

Warburton, John et al. *History of the City of Dublin*. Vol II. London, 1818. PDF file.

Watts, Alan. *The Way of Zen*. Pantheon Books Inc., 1985. Print.

Zalta, Edward N. et al., "The Correspondence Truth." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Library of Congress Catalogue Data, 2016, plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth-correspondence/. Web. 15 June 2016.

Author's Biography

Irina Kovačević, born in 1986 in Doboj, Bosnia and Herzegovina, obtained a Bachelor in English and English Literature from the Faculty of Foreign Languages in Belgrade, Department of English in 2010. In 2012, she earned her Master's in English Language, Literature and Culture from the Faculty of Philology at Belgrade University, defending her master thesis: "Stream of Consciousness Presented through English Literature: James Joyce's *Ulysses*". Thereafter, she enrolled into her doctoral studies the same year, in English Literature, at the same Department.

Since 2012, while pursuing her doctorate, she has worked as an EFL and ESL teacher. In November 2014, she started working for the Law Office "JNP & Partners" as a translator and regular consultant.

As a Joycean scholar, in 2016, she was awarded a full scholarship from the Trieste Joyce School. She also is an associate member and participant of the Bloomsday festival, held annually in Pula, Croatia.

In addition to being intensively engaged in the life and work of James Joyce, the fields of her interest are modern English and American literature, literary criticism, as well as literary and professional translation. She regularly attends conferences, seminars and workshops; publishes scientific and professional papers in leading journals of national importance.

She lives and works in Belgrade.

Изјава о ауторству

Име и презиме аутора _____ Ирина Н. Ковачевић _____

Број индекса _____ 11138д _____

Изјављујем

да је докторска дисертација под насловом

Употреба архетипских структура у прози Џејмса Џојса

(The Use of Archetypal Structures in James Joyce's Fiction)

- резултат сопственог истраживачког рада;
- да дисертација у целини ни у деловима није била предложена за стицање друге дипломе према студијским програмима других високошколских установа;
- да су резултати коректно наведени и
- да нисам кршио/ла ауторска права и користио/ла интелектуалну својину других лица.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, 11.10.2017.

Ирина Ковачевић

Изјава о истоветности штампане и електронске верзије докторског рада

Име и презиме аутора Ирина Н. Ковачевић

Број индекса 11138д

Студијски програм докторске академске студије

Наслов рада Употреба архетипских структура у прози Џејмса Џојса
(The Use of Archetypal Structures in James Joyce's Fiction)

Ментор проф. др Зоран Пауновић

Изјављујем да је штампана верзија мог докторског рада истоветна електронској верзији коју сам предао/ла ради похрањена у **Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду**.

Дозвољавам да се објаве моји лични подаци везани за добијање академског назива доктора наука, као што су име и презиме, година и место рођења и датум одбране рада.

Ови лични подаци могу се објавити на мрежним страницама дигиталне библиотеке, у електронском каталогу и у публикацијама Универзитета у Београду.

Потпис аутора

У Београду, 11.10.2017.

Ирина Ковачевић

Изјава о коришћењу

Овлашћујем Универзитетску библиотеку „Светозар Марковић“ да у Дигитални репозиторијум Универзитета у Београду унесе моју докторску дисертацију под насловом:

Употреба архетипских структура у прози Џејмса Џојса

(The Use of Archetypal Structures in James Joyce's Fiction)

која је моје ауторско дело.

Дисертацију са свим прилозима предао/ла сам у електронском формату погодном за трајно архивирање.

Моју докторску дисертацију похрањену у Дигиталном репозиторијуму Универзитета у Београду и доступну у отвореном приступу могу да користе сви који поштују одредбе садржане у одабраном типу лиценце Креативне заједнице (Creative Commons) за коју сам се одлучио/ла.

1. Ауторство (CC BY)
2. Ауторство – некомерцијално (CC BY-NC)
3. Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада (CC BY-NC-ND)
4. Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима (CC BY-NC-SA)
5. Ауторство – без прерада (CC BY-ND)
6. Ауторство – делити под истим условима (CC BY-SA)

(Молимо да заокружите само једну од шест понуђених лиценци.
Кратак опис лиценци је саставни део ове изјаве).

Потпис аутора

У Београду, 11.10.2017.



1. **Ауторство.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце, чак и у комерцијалне сврхе. Ово је најслободнија од свих лиценци.

2. **Ауторство – некомерцијално.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела.

3. **Ауторство – некомерцијално – без прерада.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, без промена, преобликовања или употребе дела у свом делу, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела. У односу на све остале лиценце, овом лиценцом се ограничава највећи обим права коришћења дела.

4. **Ауторство – некомерцијално – делити под истим условима.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце и ако се прерада дистрибуира под истом или сличном лиценцом. Ова лиценца не дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела и прерада.

5. **Ауторство – без прерада.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, без промена, преобликовања или употребе дела у свом делу, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце. Ова лиценца дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела.

6. **Ауторство – делити под истим условима.** Дозвољаваате умножавање, дистрибуцију и јавно саопштавање дела, и прераде, ако се наведе име аутора на начин одређен од стране аутора или даваоца лиценце и ако се прерада дистрибуира под истом или сличном лиценцом. Ова лиценца дозвољава комерцијалну употребу дела и прерада. Слична је софтверским лиценцама, односно лиценцама отвореног кода.