JOYCE’S “CIRCE”: STEPHEN’S HETEROGLOSSIA, LIBERATORY VIOLENCE, AND THE IMAGINED ANTINATIONAL COMMUNITY, A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE MASTER OF ARTS EMPHASIS IN LITERATURE BY CHRISTOPHER G. LEONARD DIRECTED BY DR. PATRICK COLLIER BALL STATE UNIVERSITY MUNCIE, INDIANA MAY 2012
I believe that a new application of postcolonial theory to James Joyce’s *Ulysses* can open the doors through which we can see Joyce’s text as subversive, ironic, politically charged, and historically significant. I think that positioning Joyce within the anticolonial modernist tradition\(^1\) will show how we can push beyond reading Joyce as merely a satirist and see him for what I believe to be his most powerful achievement: the writing of an Irish revolution. Over the past thirty years, there has been a significant trend in Joyce criticism that examines and problematizes the ways in which Joyce can be read as a postcolonial writer. I intend to outline some of the major critics that have examined how Joyce and *Ulysses* can be seen as advocates for Irish independence.

---

\(^1\) Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz’s “The New Modernist Studies” discusses the necessity and problems of expanding modernism as a field of study to look at “how modernists responded to imperialism, engaged in projects of anticolonialism, and designated new models of transnational community” (739).
Ultimately, while most critics agree that Joyce can certainly be understood as anticolonial, there remains a debate as to what “kind” of postcolonial writer is Joyce: that is, is Joyce a nationalist writer advocating for the popular pro-Gaelic sentiments of his time while writing in exile, or is he an antinationalist writer critiquing the popular bourgeois nationalists from the periphery? I will discuss a number of critics that place Joyce on either side of the national isle. However, I believe that an examination of Stephen Dedalus in episode 15, “Circe,” of *Ulysses* demonstrates a resounding critique of the colonial regime as well as a rejection of the homogenizing bourgeois nationalists.

Colin MacCabe’s collection of essays, *James Joyce: New Perspectives* (1982), was a landmark work in Joyce studies that called for new theoretical approaches to examine the ways in which Joyce represents the nation (126). MacCabe’s essay, “James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word,” calls for a new criticism that will “delineate those moments, historical and symbolic, in which fictional forms produce the language and identity of a nation” (126).

A number of critics have since responded to MacCabe by examining the ways Joyce’s texts, especially *Ulysses*, can be read as Irish national literature. Vincent Cheng writes in *Joyce, Race, and Empire* (1995), “Joyce wrote insistently from a perspective of a colonial subject of an oppressive empire” (i). Enda Duffy writes in *The Subaltern Ulysses* (1994), that *Ulysses* is "the starred text of an Irish national literature […] nothing less […] than the book of Irish postcolonial independence" (2-3), and he calls it “a guerrilla text” (10) that has "all the time been covertly operating as a postcolonial novel" (5). Emer Nolan writes in *James Joyce and Nationalism* (1995), “*Ulysses* powerfully suggests Joyce’s hostility to British colonial rule in Ireland” (57). Cheng, Duffy, and
Leonard Nolan all seem to agree that *Ulysses* can be read as a national text that champions Irish independence from British colonial rule.

However, not all critics find that Joyce is strictly a nationalist sympathizer. David Lloyd’s *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-Colonial Moment* (1993) argues that Joyce is antinationalist because his work is critical of the repressive and homogenizing culture of the Celtic Revivalists who called for the cleansing of the Irish state in favor of a pure Gaelic language, identity, culture, and race. He argues that Joyce’s unconventional style, a general lack of narrative structure, and diverse forms of cultural representations throughout the novel seem to subvert the monologic desire of nationalism. He writes, "The anti-representational tendency in Irish literature” produces “the hybrid quality of popular forms" that manages to "exceed the monologic desire of cultural nationalism" (89). Lloyd seems to say that Joyce’s diversified and “hybrid quality” of his portrayal of life in Ireland encompasses too large a scope to characterize Joyce or *Ulysses* as strictly nationalist.

In an attempt to reconcile these contrasting views of Joyce as nationalist or anti-nationalist, Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes’ collection of essays, *Semicolonial Joyce* (2000), appreciates both national and antinational sentiments in Joyce. Their work unifies the growing postcolonial interest in Joyce by putting together some of the major postcolonial critics of Joyce who may differ in their readings of Joyce; however, they all seem to value Joyce’s texts, especially *Ulysses*, as politically charged, subversive, and historically significant pieces of Irish literature. Attridge and Howes explain in their introduction, “The critical practice of contrasting Joyce’s tolerant cosmopolitan modernism with the narrow Irish nationalism he rejected is reaching the limits of its
usefulness; in its place postcolonial studies offers ways of articulating nationalism both imperialist and anti-imperialist, and modernism as interdependent rather than opposed phenomena” (11).

I think that reading *Ulysses* as an anticolonial text that is simultaneously critical of the Celtic Revivalist movement (championed by contemporaries of Joyce like of John Eglinton and A.E., also known as George Russell) is the most productive way to understand how Joyce champions and critiques Irish independence. Tracey Schwarce combines a national and antinational reading of Joyce’s text her essay “Silencing Stephen: Colonial Pathologies in Victorian Dublin” (1997). She acknowledges how scholars like Cheng and Duffy have “argued forcefully for Joyce's position as a subaltern writer concerned with representing the divisive and devastating effects of colonial oppression in Ireland” (243). However, she goes on to say that she not only reads the novel as a national text, but also as an antinational text that critiques (similarly to Lloyd) the hard-line stance of the Celtic Revivalists. She writes, “While I agree that Joyce certainly sees British imperialism as a fundamental cause of Irish political chaos […], I would also assert that Joyce's primary purpose […] is not so much to condemn British mistreatment of Ireland as it is to expose and deride Ireland's oppression of its own sons and daughters as it attempts the impossible task of ‘purifying’ or ‘de-anglicizing’ Irish culture” (243-244).

Schwarce positions Stephen as representing a median between nationalist discourse and colonial oppression. She writes, “As Stephen Dedalus wanders through the din of competing discourses that make up the modern Irish nation, he helps Joyce to reveal that those who would promote hegemony and insularity - whether the forms be
British or Irish - would destroy the very nation they would create” (246). She engages in a close reading of episode 9, “Scylla and Charybdis,” that depicts Stephen professing his controversial theories of Shakespeare in the National Library to his professors John Eglinton and George Russell, who are also prominent leaders of the Celtic Revivalist movement. Schwarce argues that Stephen challenges both colonial oppression and national revivalist conservatism. She writes:

Stephen makes three points about the playwright that are completely antithetical to the goals of the Irish Revival: first, that Shakespeare glorified not the peasantry, but the elite classes to which he himself belonged; second, that he represented in his art not the virtue of the English race but its corrupted chastity, which he had experienced first hand (as both cuckold and adulterer); and third, that he promoted a politicized agenda that propelled England's imperialist aims. [256]

Schwarce concludes by saying that Stephen fails in his attempt to “change the conscious of the revival” (256). That is to say, Stephen fails to prove his controversial Shakespeare theories to his professors. She then suggests that Stephen is left with only two choices after being rejected by Eglinton and Russell: he can either submit to the ideology and leadership of the revivalists, or he can go off into obscurity. She says, “These then, are the high stakes of this scene: if Stephen is unable to change the attitudes of the revival, then he is left either to degrade his muse and join the movement (which he will not do), or to go his own way in obscurity” (257). I do not believe that Stephen is left with only these two options. I believe that he chooses a third alternative: discursive and violent rebellion.
I agree with Schwarce that Stephen represents Joyce’s critique of British colonial rule and the nationalist bourgeois. However, I do not agree with Schwarce that Stephen only seeks Irish independence through a form of passive diplomacy, like orating his aesthetic and literary theories in a library. I believe that Stephen enacts a heteroglossic discourse in episode 15, “Circe,” that critiques both imperialism and the nationalist bourgeois. Moreover, Stephen engages not only in an aesthetic rebellion, but he engages in the only anticolonial violence in *Ulysses* against the British soldier Private Carr. Thus, I believe that Stephen separates himself from the ideology of the colonizer and from the bourgeois nationalists through aesthetic, political, and violent means. I will conduct my examination of Stephen as a revolutionary colonial intellectual in three parts using the work of three respective theorists: Mikhail Bakhtin, Frantz Fanon, and Benedict Anderson. Ultimately, I intend to show that Stephen can be read as a gateway through which Joyce represents a new heterogeneous, anticolonial, and antinational community in Ireland.

Episode 15, “Circe,” marks Stephen’s aesthetic and violent separation from the nationalist bourgeois and colonial regimes. The episode’s heteroglossic style and Stephen’s own heteroglossia violates the monolithic pretensions of nationalist discourse. Stephen not only uses language to catalyze his revolution but he physically challenges the colonial regime during his fight with an English soldier that ignites the liberatory violence necessary for decolonization. I believe that Stephen’s linguistic and violent

---

2 While there were of course multiple, conflicting opinions within nationalist discourse in turn-of-the-century Ireland, Joyce’s project in *Ulysses* sets up nationalist discourse as comparatively homogenous. See footnote 3 below for David Lloyd’s take on the relative uniformity of the nationalist discourse that Joyce subverts in the novel.
subversion of both colonial and nationalist oppression imagines a potentially new community: an inclusive heterogeneous community for freedom from foreign and domestic oppression in Ireland.

I will begin by looking at the heteroglossic style of episode 15 and also Stephen’s discourse primarily through Mikhail Bakhtin’s *The Dialogic Imagination*. I will argue that Joyce and Stephen’s heteroglossic style is much more than simply an aesthetic experimentation. Rather, I will argue that such heteroglossia is fundamentally political because it subverts the aspired homogeneity of nationalist discourse. Thus, I intend to make clear that both Joyce and Stephen use language to galvanize a sociopolitical revolution couched in heterogeneity.

In “Discourse in the Novel,” Bakhtin defines the novel as “a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized” (262). The novel then consists not only of different individual voices of characters and narrators, but of different types of speech as well. Those speech types can be “social dialects, characteristic of group behavior, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, 

---

3 I will go on to make clear that the homogeneity of nationalist discourse that Joyce contends began with the Young Ireland movement in the late 19th century. This movement was led by Thomas Davis’ “Our National Language” that called for the revival of the Gaelic language, or “mother-tongue.” The Young Ireland movement is marked by a unisonance, or univocal message that is defined by an overwhelming message of homogeneity in every aspect: one language, one voice, one race, one culture, one nation. David Lloyd explains in “Writing in the Shit: Beckett, Nationalism and the Colonial Subject” that Young Ireland’s linguistic “shift is inseparable from the specific project of bourgeois nationalism in Ireland, namely, the forging of a sense of Irish identity that would transcend historically determined cultural and political differences and form the reconciliatory centre of national unity” (45).
languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day” (262-263). These many kinds of diverse social speech types constitute what Bakhtin terms “heteroglossia.” Furthermore, he clarifies how it is that heteroglossia can be dialogically introduced into the genre of a novel. He explains, “authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia [raznorecie] can enter the novel” (263).

Bakhtin explains that there is a sociopolitical aspect of heteroglossia in the novel because it can reveal the ideology of the author through the ways in which the author represents social conflict via conflicting social discourses, or speech types. He writes:

When heteroglossia enters the novel it becomes subject to an artistic reworking. The social and historical voices populating language, all its words and all its forms, which provide language with its particular concrete conceptualizations, are organized in the novel into a structured stylistic system that expresses the differentiated socio-ideological position of the author amid the heteroglossia of his epoch. [300]

That is to say, by examining the different social speech types and particular discourses apparent in the novel we can begin to see the sociopolitical conflicts that the author draws upon. Furthermore, the fruits of such an examination may even lead to understanding where the author himself stands amidst the contextualized sociopolitical conflict within his work.
I will argue that the narrative style of Episode 15 as a drama\(^4\) demonstrates Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia. Also, Stephen’s own double-voiced discourse is heteroglossic in nature. These two levels of heteroglossia undermine the monolithic style and homogeneous message of the bourgeois nationalists. Thus, through examining heteroglossia it will become clear that Joyce and Stephen’s sociopolitical position is anticolonial \textit{and} antinationalist.

Episode 15 is in the style of a drama. It opens with stage directions providing the scene and mood for the episode. Each character’s name appears above their speech as it would in the text of a drama. The “inserted genre” of a drama into the novel is an example of one of the mechanisms that allows for heteroglossia to enter the novel (Bakhtin 263). Furthermore, throughout the drama (episode), diverse forms of speech types, like “social dialects, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day” (262-263), appear relentlessly. I will provide but a few examples of heteroglossia in the chapter, aside from that of the generic language of a drama that runs throughout. As a note, the stage directions within the “generic language” of a drama are traditionally considered “authorial language,” thus evidencing two speech types that can be considered part of the massive heteroglossia going on throughout this episode (Bakhtin 263). Then, I will examine Stephen’s own heteroglossic style of double-voiced discourse.

\(^4\) Michael Sinding’s “\textit{Ginera Mixta}: Conceptual Blending and Mixed Genres in \textit{Ulysses}” says that the “Circe” episode “illustrates how conventions of dramatic presentations are blended with conventions of novelistic presentation to produce new conventions for the mixed-genre ‘drama-in-novel’” (599).
As the episode opens with Bloom following Stephen to the brothel, Bloom falls into a hallucinatory trial of his identity and character as an Irishman with alien heritage. Many characters help to introduce the “professional jargon” of judiciary proceedings. Bloom begins his own form of testimonial defense saying, “Gentlemen of the jury, let me explain” (15.775). George Fottrell assuming the role of judge says, “Order in court! The accused will now make a bogus statement” (15.896-7). J. J. O’ Molloy follows with the jargon of a defense attorney/barrister. With the stage directions included (that are separate from O’ Molloy’s own speech), O’ Molloy says, “(in barrister’s grey wig and stuffgown, speaking with a voice of pained protest) This is no place for indecent levity at the expense of an erring mortal disguised in liquor. […] My client is an infant, a poor foreign immigrant who started scratch as a stowaway and is now trying to turn an honest penny” (15.939-945). Aside from the figurative and literal happenings in the episode, Bloom and the other characters help to usher in heteroglossia in the form of the “professional jargon” of legal proceedings. Furthermore, the Late Lord Mayor Harrington appears and provides an example of “languages of the authorities” (Bakhtin 263). He says (including stage directions), “(in scarlet robe with mace, gold mayoral chain and large white silk scarf) That alderman sir Leo Bloom’s speech be printed at the expense of the ratepayers” (15.1385-6). He is delivering some sort of decree on Bloom and the printing of Bloom’s speech. This form of “language of authority” also exemplifies the “languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day” because having an authoritative mayor deliver administrative and civil decrees in regards to his electorate evidences the democratic government existing in Dublin, ergo: sociopolitical purposes. Episode 15 endlessly exemplifies diverse speech types of other
“professional jargon” and “language of authority” ranging from medicine to religion to politics. The episode also demonstrates various “social dialects” of whores, townspeople, the dead English King Edward II, the martyred Croppy Boy, folk songs like “Who Goes with Fergus” and “The Croppy Boy,” that all help to construct heteroglossia. With that being acknowledged, I will turn my attention to how Stephen acts as a mechanism that ushers heteroglossia into the novel.

Stephen ushers in heteroglossia through a “diversity of languages” because he speaks in Latin and French repeatedly (Bakhtin 262). He also mixes the Latin and French in with the “professional jargon” of an intellectual as he speaks to Lynch’s cap sitting atop a piano that he’s playing in the brothel. The subject of Stephen’s discussion is confused because he is intoxicated, but it seems to regard a musical scale called the “perfect fifth.” He says:

As a matter of fact it is of no importance whether Benedetto Marcello found it or made it. The rite is the poet’s rest. It may be an old hymn to Demeter or also illustrate Coela enarrant gloriam Domini. It is susceptible of nodes or modes as far apart as hyperpyrgian and mixolydian and of texts so divergent as priests hailhooping round David’s that is Circe’s or what am I saying Ceres’ altar and David’s tip from the stable to his chief bassoonist about the allrightness of his almightiness. Mais nom de nom, that is another pair of trousers. Jetez la gourme. Faut que jeunesse se passe. (he stops, points at Lynch’s cap, smiles and laughs) Which side is your knowledge bump? [his emphasis, 15.2087-95]
What is important to focus on here is Stephen’s seamless transitions between English, Latin, and French which distinguish him as a man of letters, or an intellectual who has studied foreign languages to the point of fluency. Further, his actual discussion while confused still references mythic figures like Demeter and Circe and the Italian composer Marcello’s work with biblical psalms, particularly psalm 19 that Stephen references in Latin, “Coela enarrant gloriam Domini” (15.2089). Thus, we can see how Stephen exemplifies what Bakhtin’s explains as the “speech of characters [i.e. Stephen’s] are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel” (263) in the form of diverse speech types like the “diversity of languages” (262) and “professional jargon” (262).

So why is Stephen’s heteroglossia in episode 15 significant? Beyond the artistic experimentation of inserting genres, diverse speech types and languages into the genre of the novel, I believe that the heteroglossic style that Joyce chose to incorporate carries with it a sociopolitical significance as well. The Young Ireland movement that began in the late nineteenth century advocated for the Gaelic Revival, i.e. the revival of the Irish language, Gaelic, and Irish literature written in Gaelic. The nationalist message sent out was one of homogeneity and unisonance: one language, one voice, one race, one culture, one nation. Joyce’s heteroglossia is fundamentally founded on the heterogeneity of

---

5 The term “unisonance” is taken from Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*. Anderson uses it to describe a simultaneous and unifying experience of many people singing the same melody and verses of a national song like a national anthem that unites a community (145). Here I use it in reference to the nationalist Young Ireland movement that aspired to use a unitary language (Gaelic) to politically unite, or homogenize the Irish people against British influence in Ireland.

6 Lloyd reiterates the homogenizing or “normalizing” aesthetics of nationalist literature: “Hence, from Young Ireland through to Corkery, a normal literature is a national
languages, voices, peoples, and sociopolitical ideas. Thus, the very nature of Joyce’s heteroglossic discourse undercuts the nationalist bourgeois message of one language, one nation (that began with the Young Ireland movement).

David Lloyd writes in “Adulteration and the Nation” that the goal of his project is to “explore more fully how not only the anti-representational tendency in Irish literature but also the hybrid quality of popular forms constantly exceed the monologic desire of cultural nationalism, a desire which centres on the lack of an Irish epic” (89). He goes on to argue that “street ballads” exemplify the “heterogeneous and hybridized culture” of Irish literature that violates the monologic desire of cultural nationalism (99). He writes:

Ironically, what is properly, in Brechtian terms, an epic distance belongs more frequently to the street ballad than to the nationalist ballads intended to replace them. Self-consciously produced as commodities, and with the ephemeral aptness to momentary need or desire that is the property of the commodity, the street ballads often achieve an effect akin to montage in which the contours of an heterogeneous [sic] and hybridized culture can become apparent without necessarily losing political force. Indeed, a large part of the pleasure of the street ballad is political and lies in its use of ‘extravagant allegories’: what it exploits is precisely the unevenness of knowledge that characterizes the colonized society. [his emphasis, 99]
The street ballad is like a “montage” of the “heterogeneous and hybridized culture” of Ireland that is full of “political force” and is often at odds with the “nationalist ballads intended to replace them.” An example of such a street ballad would be the “The Croppy Boy.” Carroll Malone’s version of 1902 is a ballad about a young Catholic peasant boy, a croppie, who had supported the 1798 uprising against Britain who later sought confession in a church. However, he was tricked by an English soldier hiding in the confessional into confessing his involvement in the revolution. The English soldier arrested the boy and took him to jail where the boy was executed. The Croppy Boy, like many Gaelic folk ballads as noted by Lloyd, is political in nature. It incorporates hybrid elements typical of other Gaelic folk songs found in *Irish Street Ballads* by Colm O Lochlainn. Lloyd explains:

> A very high incidence of the songs [in *Irish Street Ballads*] is devoted to migration or emigration, to conscription or enlistment in the British army, as well as to the celebration of the 1798 uprising and a range of rebel heroes. [...] At the stylistic level, the street ballads at moments provide an even more intimate register of the processes of cultural hybridization. They are, most often, adaptations of traditional airs to English words, enforcing frequently a distortion of standard English pronunciation or syntax to fit Gaelic musical and speech rhythms. [93-94]

Thus, we can see how folk songs like the Croppy Boy that commemorate the 1798 rebellion are heteroglossic because of their “specific sociopolitical purposes” but also because of their multivocality. The latter part of the above excerpt explains the hybrid

---

7 See p. 293 of Don Gifford’s *Ulysses Annotated*, annotation 11.39.
quality of folk songs that are “adaptations of traditional airs to English words enforcing frequently a distortion of standard English pronunciation or syntax to fit Gaelic musical and speech rhythms” (94). This kind of hybridization of languages, speech styles and conventions, and cultures creates a unique multivocality that is at odds with nationalist ballads that espouse a unisonance, or univocality of one language, culture, and message.

Joyce incorporates the sociopolitical language and heterogeneous style of “The Croppy Boy” directly into episode 158. Interestingly, the Croppy Boy appears to sing his own song to support Stephen while he fights with an English solider. He says, with the stage directions included, “(the rope noose round his neck, gripes in his issuing bowels with both hands) I bear no hate to a living thing, / But I love my country beyond my king” (15.4531-4). These lines that the Croppy Boy sings are taken directly from Caroll Malone’s 1902 version. Here we see heteroglossia at work by the inclusion of the Croppy Boy’s “generic language” of song lyrics inserted into an episode already incorporating the generic language of drama9. The croppy’s speech also evidences “language that serve[s] the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day” because he announces his loyalty to Ireland over the king. The timing of the Croppy Boy’s appearance is significant in that he appears as Stephen begins to engage in his own sociopolitical discourse concerning Irish sovereignty with an English soldier. That is, the Croppy Boy appears as a sympathetic figure that reinforces Stephen’s discourse against British colonization represented by the English soldier. The Croppy Boy’s appearance,

8 The song is also sung throughout episode 11, “Sirens.” The song’s lyrics are sewn into the episode’s unique narrative structure or technique of a fugue.
9 See footnote 4 above on Sinding’s “Ginera Mixta: Conceptual Blending and Mixed Genres in Ulysses.”
of course, also memorializes Irish revolutionaries who fought for Irish sovereignty against Britain in 1798, as well as the numerous subsequent uprisings during the 19th century.

Stephen’s discourse with the English soldier exemplifies his own sociopolitical heteroglossia (as opposed to his heteroglossia of diverse languages and professional jargon mentioned above). When Stephen leaves the brothel and is approached by two English soldiers he speaks to them in a comic and ironic way that enacts a “double-voiced discourse” that evidences both his distaste for the colonial regime and Joyce’s antinational aesthetics. First, Bakhtin reminds us how comic, ironic, or parodic discourse is a form of “double-voiced discourse” that exemplifies heteroglossia as well as authorial sociopolitical opinion. He writes:

Heteroglossia, once incorporated into the novel (whatever the forms for its incorporation), is another’s speech in another’s language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Such speech constitutes a special type of double-voiced discourse. It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. […]. Examples of this would be comic, ironic or parodic discourse, the refracting discourse of a narrator, refracting discourse in the language of a character and finally the discourse of a whole incorporated genre—all these discourses are double-voiced and internally dialogized. [his emphasis, 324]
As Stephen is approached by the two English soldiers he says, “You are my guests. Uninvited. By virtue of the fifth of George and seventh of Edward. History to blame. Fabled by mothers of memory” (15.4371-72). Stephen is clearly being comic and ironic with the ambiguity and insincerity of his language. He says to them that they are his “guests.” Yet he is neither at home, nor were they invited to join him in the street in the “nighttown” district\(^{10}\) because it is a public space where invitations are superfluous, or irrelevant. Rather, Stephen alludes to the colonial occupation of Ireland “by virtue of the fifth of George and seventh of Edward” as the cause of the soldiers’ “uninvited” presence. Stephen is playing with his words to not so cleverly veil his distaste for the English military presence that still infects Ireland after centuries of colonization: or what he simply calls “history.” History of course is “the nightmare from which [he is] trying to awake” (2.377). The final line, “Fabled by mothers of memory,” refers to a similar line from William Blake’s *A Vision of Last Judgment*: “Fable or Allegory is Form’d by the daughters of Memory.”\(^{11}\) Interestingly, I believe Stephen changes Blake’s use of “daughters” to “mothers” to parodize the colonial allegory that the empire is like a “mother” to the “infant-like” colony. Blake of course was a very controversial English poet who was notoriously anti-imperial and even anarchist in his sensibilities. Stephen’s use of Blake’s language helps to make his double-voiced discourse and his intention become quite clear. By co-opting Blake’s poetic speech, Stephen uses “another’s speech” in “another’s language” (the English language, as opposed to Gaelic) to enact a “double-voiced” polemic against England (Bakhtin 324-325). It is also worth noting that

\(^{10}\) See p. 452 of Gifford’s *Ulysses Annotated*. In the opening description of the episode, the scene is described as “nighttown,” which is Dublin slang for the red-light district.

\(^{11}\) See p. 30 of Gifford’s *Ulysses Annotated*, annotation 2.7.
Stephen’s double-voicedness of using Blake’s poetic work, speaking in English, and, most importantly, the fact that he does not even know Gaelic (while he’s fluent in numerous other languages) further separates Stephen from the Gaelic Revival. Stephen’s heteroglossia embodies a heteroglot of languages, cultures, speech types, and sociopolitical opinions that undercut any colonial or national affiliation. But what does Stephen’s double-voicedness “refract” about Joyce’s intentions?

Well, without overstepping the myriad of critical opinions on Joyce’s politics,¹² I look again to Bakhtin to elucidate the greatest import of double-voicedness and heteroglossia in the novel. Bakhtin explains, “This double-voicedness in prose is prefigured in language itself (in authentic metaphors, as well as in myth), in language as a social phenomenon that is becoming in history, socially stratified and weathered in the process of becoming” (326). Double-voicedness, or heteroglossic language is meant to represent a “social phenomenon that is becoming in history.” Joyce’s *Ulysses* is written in lock step historically with the Irish Revolution of the early twentieth century.¹³ There is no doubt that *Ulysses* represents the “social phenomenon” of the “process of becoming” of the Irish Free State. Aside from the historical background surrounding the text, the text itself goes a long way to usher in anticolonial sentiments, especially through the figure of Stephen. However, I argue that Joyce uses Stephen in a subtler manner than just to express anticolonial sentiments as seen above. As I have argued, Joyce clearly imbues in episode 15 and in Stephen a deep, penetrating heteroglossia. This

---


¹³ See Enda Duffy’s *The Subaltern Ulysses* and his discussion of Joyce writing *Ulysses* between 1914-1921 “which was exactly the period in which Ireland gained its independence from Britain in a bloody rebellion and anticolonial guerrilla war” (2).
heteroglossia in Joyce’s novel is of course political but is also antinational. Joyce’s matrix of representations, styles, dialogues, characters, and languages all serve a heteroglossic purpose which I argue evidences Joyce’s unwillingness to align his work aesthetically, or politically with the Gaelic Revival or the generally homogeneous message of one voice, one language, one culture of the bourgeois nationalists.

Joyce’s heteroglossia intends to represent and embrace the stratified state of Irish politics and art. He’s not using the novel as a genre to comfort or represent a nation, but to critique one. Perhaps then Joyce’s greatest patriotism is writing the Irish anti-epic. Bakhtin reminds us that poetic genres, like the epic, are founded on the univocality of language. He says, “The unity and singularity of language are the indispensable prerequisites for a realization of the direct (but not objectively typifying) intentional individuality of poetic style and of its monologic steadfastness” (286). I have been trying to show that the heteroglossia at work in episode 15 through a diversity speech types, a diversity of languages, professional jargons, and folk songs with languages that serve specific sociopolitical purposes, and comic or ironic discourses that create a double-voiced discourse all serve to violate the “monologic steadfastness” of a nationalist manifesto, like that of an epic. Thus, I believe that Joyce constructs Stephen’s anticolonial double-voicedness to refract his own antinational cultural aestheticism.
Now looking away from Stephen’s aesthetic and sociopolitical attack against the bourgeois nationalists and colonial regime through his heteroglossia, and looking towards Stephen’s violent attack against the colonial regime in episode 15, I will argue that Stephen’s fight with the English soldier, Private Carr, enacts the liberatory violence necessary for the potential of decolonization. Thus, I believe that Joyce’s depiction of Stephen’s moment of violence and its symbolic and galvanizing effect on the people advocate for the necessity of anticolonial violence in order to ultimately displace English colonialism.

Emer Nolan writes in *James Joyce and Nationalism* that typically there are two traditions in Irish nationalist history: “the extremist and radical ‘physical force’ tradition, and the reasonable, constitutional one” (21). He references the work of Joycean scholars Richard Ellmann’s *The Consciousness of Joyce* (1977) and Dominic Manganiello’s *Joyce’s Politics* (1980) to argue that Joyce is usually situated (philosophically and politically) with what he calls the “reasonable, constitutional” tradition. He argues: “These critics’ attempt to make some sense of what they interpret as Joyce’s ‘moderate’ nationalism avails itself of the fact that there are generally believed to be two traditions in Irish nationalist history: the extremist and radical ‘physical force’ tradition, and the
reasonable, constitutional one. As Joyce, it is felt, cannot be decently aligned with the former tradition, he clearly must find a home with the latter” (21). This is “clearly” not so clear at all. While it is sure that Joyce is against English colonization, I also wager that he is critical of the narrow-mindedness of the nationalist bourgeois (as I have previously argued through his use of heteroglossia). He cannot simply be labeled as a nationalist. Nolan does not go so far as to label him as such. However, he fails to adequately address the symbolic subtlety and political significance of the distinct moments of anticolonial violence in *Ulysses*. The moments to which I refer are the Phoenix Park murders and Stephen’s fight with Private Carr.

“In Joyce’s Representation of Political Violence,” Nolan discusses numerous critical opinions of *Ulysses*’ depiction of the Phoenix Park murders, but ultimately, Nolan resolves that criticism of the novel’s stance on political violence tends to state that Joyce even-handedly condemns the Phoenix Park murders as well as the betrayal of the Irish Invincibles by an Irish informant. He says, “Criticism of the novel more typically revolves on the unstated paradox that Joyce censures both nationalist violence, and the betrayal of its perpetrators, with admirable even-handedness” (128). He goes on to critique such even-handed criticism as “misleadingly simplified” and acknowledges that
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14 Nolan provides an essay from *The Critical Writings Of James Joyce* edited by Mason and Ellmann that describes how a group of Fenian separatists stabbed to death the “English Chief Secretary, Lord Frederick Cavendish, and the Under-Secretary, Burke, in Phoenix Park, Dublin (*CW*, p. 190)” (124). He also says both Manganiello in *Joyce’s Politics* and Matthew Hodgart in *James Joyce: A Student’s Guide* similarly state that Joyce did not believe in or advocate for political violence (128). He says that Mason and Ellmann in their prefatory remarks to *Critical Writings* chalk Joyce’s politics up to an ambiguity of middle-ground opinion in his overall political positioning (129). He acknowledges that Phillip Herring in “Joyce’s Politics” found in *New Light on Joyce from the Dublin Symposium* implies that Joyce was critical of Ireland’s failure to “respond effectively and consistently” to imperial violence (130).
Joyce’s stance on political violence “is not, however, clarified by Joyce’s own pronouncements” and can be understood then as part of the “symptomatic ambiguity in [Joyce’s] political thought” (129). However, Nolan never goes beyond rehearsing previous criticism of Joyce’s politics in regards to the political violence exemplified by the Phoenix Park murders. Simply stated, Nolan disavows a partisan stand: he simply says that Joyce’s political opinion on the Phoenix Park murders and political violence in general is ambiguous. Thus, Nolan does little to improve upon his stance to that too many critics are too quick to position Joyce as moderate. I then argue that in regards to Joyce’s stance on political violence Nolan is as complicit in the same oversimplified reception of Joyce’s politics as moderate that he himself critiques.

Moreover, in the same essay “Joyce’s Representation of Political Violence,” Nolan does articulate a specific political critique of “Circe” as a comment on Ireland’s revolution. However, again, Nolan does not use the opportunity to decisively argue one way or the other about how the episode is a reflection of Joyce’s stance on political violence. Rather, he says “Circe” is “both Joyce’s acknowledgement of Ireland’s revolution and his testimony to its limitations” (131). He ostensibly circumvents the potential political debate on violence to instead argue that “Circe” is an economic comment on Irish nationalism. He says:

More precisely, “Circe” stages the question of whether an Irish version of British capitalism is really the appropriate fulfillment of Irish nationalist aspiration. I propose that the issue of the cultural meaning of economic and political modernization – the central topic of nationalism – can here be addressed in conjunction with the modernist quest for a universal
language, one which would transcend the realm of cultural and political contestation. [his emphasis, 133]

Here we can see that Nolan admits to circumventing a thorough analysis of “cultural and political contestation” in favor of an economic and social investigation into the modernization of Ireland and the function of a universal language. His discussion of “Circe” focuses on Bloom’s moderate and reformist economic policies and Stephen’s interest in gesture as a universal language. While Nolan is always insightful, he fails to examine the symbolic and subtle ramifications of distinct moments of anticolonial violence like the Phoenix Park murders and Stephen’s fight with Private Carr. I then ask in response to Nolan’s examination of “Circe,” if we are to judge or perhaps simply to evaluate Joyce’s politics through his work, then how can we not more zealously interrogate Stephen’s fight with the British soldier and the very evident galvanizing effect this has on the people as a comment on the both the symbolic and effectual nature of anticolonial violence in Ireland as a catalyst towards decolonization? I intend to uncover symbolic ramifications of such anticolonial violence and posit those ramifications as evidence of Joyce’s optimistic valuation of political violence in hopes for political freedom.

Homi Bhabha explains in the introduction to Frantz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* just how multidimensional violence can be for the colonized. He writes that violence is much more than a moment of upheaval. It is a moment that represents the psycho-affective survival and agency of the colonized against colonialist oppression. He writes, “Fanonian violence, in my view, is part of a struggle for psycho-affective survival and a search for human agency in the midst of the agony of oppression” (xxxvi). I will
argue that Stephen as the “colonial intellectual” chooses to engage in violence with an English soldier and by doing so he rejects the oppression of both the colonial regime and national and homogenizing force of the Catholic Church of Ireland, but, and perhaps more importantly, he becomes another imaginative link in the chain of liberatory violence that pulls towards to decolonization.

Fanon’s essay “On Violence” explains how violence empowers and even unites the colonized against the colonist. He writes:

To work means to work towards the death of the colonist. Claiming responsibility for the violence also allows those members of the group who have strayed or have been outlawed to come back, to retake their place and be reintegrated. Violence can thus be understood to be the perfect mediation. The colonized man liberates himself in and through violence. This praxis enlightens the militant because it shows him the means and the end. [44]

Violence then becomes the “mediation” between colonization and liberation. Violence as a “mediator” can be understood as one that attempts to bring the immediate violence of the colonial scene to a close by inciting counter-conflict, that is to say, fighting fire with fire. Violence is of course a disruptive principle at heart, but in the context of Fanon’s formula for anticolonial struggle, there is an end game of freedom. Violence becomes “work” that shapes or creates the potential for another world outside of colonialism.

David Lloyd’s essay “Violence and the Constitution of the Novel” similarly argues that violence disrupts the oppressive status quo in hopes to create anew. He writes, “The end of this history of violence lies in the independent nation state. […].
Violence is understood as an atavistic and disruptive principal counter to the rationality of legal constitution as barbarity is to an emerging civility, anarchy to culture. In one thing, both tendencies occur: the end of violence is the legitimate state formation” (125). Whether it is viewed as atavistic in the eyes of the colonizer or emancipatory in the eyes of the colonized, violence is purposive and transformative in the hegemonic reality of the colony. Earlier in Anomalous States Lloyd points out what it is that violence “disrupts”: history. He insightfully acknowledges that violence can be seen not only as fist against gun or something of the like, but it can be something as pure as an utterance that can shake the status quo to its core. He explains, “The founding of any nation state is necessarily an act of violence irrupting as an absolute discontinuity in the course of history, an utter transformation by way of a singularly transformative utterance, and its legitimacy is established not in itself but in the subsequent rememoration it invokes” (my emphasis, 72). It is in the form of this “singularly transformative utterance” that Stephen calls out that actively disrupts the history of colonization in Ireland because it incites the first liberatory violence to take place in Ulysses.

In episode 15, I believe that Stephen utters the greatest words of freedom in all of Ulysses against the representative colonial regime. While being interrogated by the English soldier, Private Carr, Stephen champions what Fanon would describe as the work of the colonized: the death of the colonist. He says, “Struggle for life is the law of existence but but [sic.] human philirenists, notably the tsar and the king of England, have invented arbitration. (he taps his brow) But in here it is I must kill the priest and the king” (15.4434-37). This is an example of how Stephen enunciates his psycho-affective effort for survival and agency in the face of colonial oppression and national religious
oppression represented by Stephen tapping his brow. Moreover, his utterance calls for a discontinuity with “history” two-fold: he actively calls out for liberatory violence against the oppressive figurehead of colonization (the king), but also against the oppressive force of the Catholic Church in Ireland (the priest). Stephen’s utterance is surely an act of violence in that it is a “terrorist” polemic targeted against the hegemonic structures in place in Dublin. Stephen’s “act” of a “transformative utterance” is distinct from mainstream nationalist efforts because of his rejection of the Catholic Church, which is a dominant cultural pillar in Ireland that signifies a religious and national unity. He’s initiating true liberation from existing forms of oppression, foreign and domestic. This is what separates Stephen from the likes of the angry, inflamed Citizen and his nationalist group the Gaelic Athletic Association (a political cohort of the Gaelic Revival) because Stephen’s polemic discourse does not limit or homogenize its subaltern group into a singular type, race, creed, religion, or demographic. Stephen, as subaltern, who cries
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15 I use this term carefully aware of its myriad of definitions. For my purposes, I derive my definition from the Gramscian tradition of the subaltern as the subordinate group opposed to the dominant group that is discussed in “Hegemony” from Prison Notebooks. Gramsci writes, “The intellectuals are the dominant group’s ‘deputies’ exercising the subaltern function of the social hegemony and political government” (Rivkin and Ryan 673). Moreover, I refer to Stephen as subaltern as I am in conversation with Enda Duffy’s discussion of the Irish, and particularly Stephen Dedalus as a representative of “subaltern sensibility” and consciousness in The Subaltern Ulysses (5). While I am hesitant in aligning my view of the difficulty of representing and understanding what is to be subaltern with Duffy’s appropriation of the Irish as subaltern, I still defer to Duffy in my appropriation of the term as it is constantly used in his text for categorizing Irish colonials such as Stephen Dedalus. Duffy writes, “a text like Ulysses which, I suggest, was written with the forces of anticolonial revolution in view, and which profoundly embodies the subaltern concerns of a postcolonial text” (7). Duffy goes on to refer to Ulysses as “subaltern prose” (7). Furthermore, in regards to Stephen, Duffy writes, “By examining how the mimic discourses purvey derivative ideologies that control notions of subjectivity, one can read Stephen the bourgeois artist as in the last instance a signifier of what Gramsci termed ‘subalternity’: ‘the feelings of mental inferiority and habits of
out non-serviam is ironically one that embraces heterogeneity because by rejecting everything, all existing oppressive forces, he cannot be pigeon-holed or homogenized into a certain “class” of subaltern, like say a nationalist. Therefore, Stephen’s subaltern self identifies not with homogeneity, but is exemplified by heterogeneity particularly through his use of heteroglossia that embraces a heterogeneity of languages, speech types, cultures, ideologies, social dialects, and so on.

Furthermore, Stephen’s utterance is a liberatory act not only because it calls for an end to the oppressive colonial and religious history of Ireland’s subjects, but it also liberates Stephen psycho-affectively from the passive acceptance of oppression and fear that paralyzes the colonized subject. Fanon explains:

The colonized subject thus discovers that his life, his breathing and his heartbeats are the same as the colonist’s. He discovers that the skin of the colonist is not worth more than the ‘native’s.’ In other words, his world receives a fundamental jolt. The colonized’s revolutionary new assurance stems from this. If, in fact, my life is worth as much as the colonist’s, his look can no longer strike fear into me or nail me to the spot and his voice can no longer petrify me. I am no longer uneasy in his presence. [10]

In the following dialogue it will become clear that after Stephen utters his words of freedom (“I must kill the priest and king” [15.4437]), his world receives this “fundamental jolt” of “new assurance.” The English soldiers, despite their relentless threats and physiopolitical stature over Stephen, do not scare him. Stephen openly subservience and obedience which necessarily and structurally develop in situations of domination,”” (38).
antagonizes the dimwitted soldiers saying, “I seem to annoy them. Green rag to a bull” (15.4497). As Bloom begs and tries to pull Stephen away, Stephen again reiterates that he will not back down out of fear. Bloom says, “Come home. You’ll get into trouble” (15.4511). Stephen responds with great assurance of his willingness to engage in such trouble saying, “I don’t avoid it. He provokes my intelligence” (15.4513). Stephen’s assurance to Bloom of his willingness to fight with Private Carr represents his stand against colonial oppression that directly leads to action. That is, Stephen’s words lead to his moment of violence with Private Carr. This kind of action is another important aspect of the colonized’s liberation from the paralysis of fear in the face of the colonizer. Fanon explains how the colonized subject receives a new assurance but, also, and importantly, a rejection of previous passivity. He writes, “At the individual level, violence is a cleansing force. It rids the colonized of their inferiority complex, of their passive and despairing attitude. It emboldens them, and restores their self-confidence” (51). It is important to note that before Stephen utters his words of freedom, he says to Private Carr in response to Carr’s threat of bashing in Stephen’s jaw, that “Personally, I detest action,” seemingly backing down from conflict (15.4414). However, again, after his transformative utterance he says to Bloom in regards to “trouble” with Carr, “I don’t avoid it” (15.4513).

Most importantly, Stephen’s transformative utterance of “I must kill the priest and king” (15.4436-37) is in fact the most liberatory language in all of Ulysses because it leads to the first actual event of liberatory violence between the colonized and colonist. Fanon reminds us of what is required for decolonization: “Decolonization is the encounter between two congenitally antagonistic forces that in fact owe their singularity
to the kind of reification secreted and nurtured by the colonial situation” (2), and that “decolonization is always a violent event” (1). Stephen’s utterance leads directly to “two congenitally antagonistic forces” engaging in “a violent event.” That is, the colonist Private Carr bloodies the colonized Stephen with his fist and knocks Stephen to the ground (15.4747-50). What began with Stephen’s transformative utterance of words of freedom leading to a loss of a passive fear and creating in Stephen a renewed self-assurance in the face of the colonizer culminating with a moment of violence between the colonized and colonist, all liberate and construct Stephen as a proactive revolutionary. However, it is not just Stephen that feels the liberatory efforts of his moment of violence.

Fanon notes that liberatory violence does not just take place on the individual level. It has something like an atmospheric affect. It rouses and unites the masses. We can see this in the masses that surround the fight between Stephen and Private Carr. First, Fanon explains, “Colonized peoples are not alone. Despite the efforts of colonialism, their frontiers remain permeable to news and rumors. They discover that violence is atmospheric, it breaks out sporadically, and here and there sweeps away the colonial regime. The success of this violence plays not only an informative role but also an operative one” (30). I would argue that Stephen’s moment of violence can retrospectively be seen as an atmospheric effect of the anticcolonial violence in the text that took place over twenty years earlier: the Phoenix Park murders. The relation between the Phoenix Park murders and Stephen’s motivation to denounce the priest and king and fight private Carr are not directly related or causally linked. They do not have to be. Fanon embraces the inciteful and provocative nature of violence in the colony as something that is ephemeral, transitory, and sporadic. What concentrates anticolonial
violence into an atmospheric-like quality is its purposiveness to “sweep away the colonial regime” (30). Thus, the Phoenix Park murders and Stephen’s fight with Private Carr help to construct what Fanon describes as a kind of atmospheric violence because they are both directed against the colonial regime.

In a more immediate sense, Stephen’s moment of violence has an immediate atmospheric effect on those around him. As the mass of people form around the fight, two sides become clear: pro-English and pro-Irish reflecting the spirit of their respective fighter. The Citizen stands in the mob surrounding the fight reciting pro-Irish verse: “May God above / Send down a dove / With Teeth as sharp as razors / to slit the throats / Of the English Dogs / That hanged our Irish leaders” (15.4525-30). The Croppy Boy appears and recites, “I bear no hate to a living thing, / But I love my country beyond the king” (15.4534-35). Sweeney Todd the Demon Barber then appears and pulls tight the noose tied around the Croppy Boy’s neck (15.4543-45). A less hallucinogenic or symbolic instance of actual physical counter-violence takes place as well. A Hag defends Stephen saying, “What call had the redcoat to strike the gentleman and he under the influence. Let them go and fight the Boers!” (15.4759-60). A Bawd rebukes the Hag in favor of the English soldier crying back, “Listen to who’s talking! Hasn’t the soldier a right to go with his girl? He gave him the coward’s blow” (15.4762-63). In stage directions directly after the Bawd’s rebuke of the Hag, we see that they fight!“(They grab at each other’s hair, claw at each other and spit.)” (15.4764).

Lastly, and most importantly, while Stephen’s utterance is certainly an “act” of violence that leads directly to his moment of violence with Private Carr that in turn produces a certain level of atmospheric violence in the surrounding mob, there is
altogether a different kind of violence that takes place as a result of Stephen’s now infamous utterance. This kind of violence is the violence of decolonization, an absolute rupture with history that is not a literal event but rather a kind of temporal fissure in the colonial situation that recalls the past in order to re-imagine a future outside of colonialism. This form of violence is called “absolute violence.” Samira Kawash’s “Terrorists and Vampires: Fanon’s Spectral Violence of Decolonization” elaborates on Fanon’s idea of absolute violence. She first establishes that Fanonian violence can be understood as two different forms or modes of violence: a kind of instrumental or purposive violence, but also a violence that is in excess of instrumental violence (237). This excess is the absolute violence “that destroys the colonial world to make way for a new humanity” (237). She elaborates:

[Fanon’s absolute violence] is an uncanny violence in excess of any instrumentally conceived ends, a violence that cannot be contained or comprehended within social reality. The absolute violence of decolonization is outside agency or representation; rather, it interrupts and erupts into history and wrests history open to the possibility of justice radically foreclosed by the colonial order of reality. Fanon suggests that there is on the other side of this irruption the possibility of a “new humanity.” [239-240].

This violence is “uncanny” in a Freudian sense because it used to be familiar, or known to target the colonial regime in expected ways of revolt by the people, but it has become strangely unfamiliar in its re-presentation in that it is not of the people but of the past. It bares no materiality, no singular event, yet produces an excess of a constant threat that
she likens to the concept of “terrorism” found in popular media. Thus, Kawash says absolute violence becomes like “a specter that haunts the social order” (238).

I would then argue that the emergence (or hallucination) of the colonial specters brought to the fore via Stephen enact this kind of absolute violence of decolonization. In episode 15, after Stephen utters his words of freedom, the scene becomes saturated with apocalyptic images of “brimstone fires spring up” (15.4661) and “The midnight sun is darkened” (15.4669) and “The earth trembles” (15.4670), which seem to indicate that the colonial world may be coming to an end. Specters of the colonial past are conjured forth in what can be read as the manifestation of absolute violence possibly to destroy the colonial world in favor of a new humanity. This absolute violence “wrests history open” spilling out all the colonial heroes that failed to affect Irish independence before. These specters of the dead paradoxically signify the re-presentation of the “possibility of justice” for the Irish that has since been “foreclosed by the colonial order of reality.” The text reads that “A chasm open with a noiseless yawn” (15.4672) and bursting forth are Irish heroes reappearing side by side like “Wolfe Tone against Henry Grattan, Smith O’Brien against Daniel O’Connell, Michael Davitt against Issace Butt, Justin M’Carthy against Parnell, Arthur Griffith against John Redmond” (15.4682-85). These historical specters were once in the past, familiar, defeated casualties of the colonial situation in Ireland but now reappear in a time not their own, in an inexplicable and uncanny way, unclear as to who if any (living) persons are aware of their eruption into the present from their fissure with historical continuity. I would argue, in the Fanonian sense of absolute

---

16 Justin M’Carthy, Arthur Griffith, and John Redmond were still alive during the setting (and writing) of *Ulysses*; however, in 1904, they still existed as part of the historical anticolonial effort in Ireland that had yet to achieve its aim of Home Rule until 1921.
violence discussed by Kawash, that these specters are not merely nostalgic bursts of memory imagined by Stephen; rather that they are the violence excess of the colonial past interrupting and disturbing the reality of the present. It is important to note that Kawash stipulates that absolute violence opens history up to the possibility of justice through a revision of the past. I think these specters come forth in concert with Stephen’s anticolonial efforts to reinvigorate such a possibility of justice for the Irish, to allow for the hope that the past will no longer determine the future but in fact that anticolonial violence in its numerous forms can interrupt and upset the colonial reality so that it can all be changed, changed utterly. What is most powerful and profound about the atmospheric anticolonial violence in episode 15 is that it functions to create the possibility of a new future for Ireland outside of the present colonial reality that begins by challenging or creating a discontinuity with the dominant structures of the colonial past.

Though the examples of anticolonial violence in episode 15 are short-lived, it must be acknowledged that Stephen’s fight with Private Carr nears the end of *Ulysses*, which of course is the end of the day that envelops the narrative. This leaves a very small window of time for the atmospheric affect of violence to develop into counter-violence, or even decolonization for that matter. However, what is most important in viewing Stephen as the colonial intellectual who uses a transformative utterance to challenge the colonial regime and nationalist monolith of religion and culture is that he becomes liberated from passivity and fear in favor of proactive self-assurance and engages in physical violence against the colonial state. His anticolonial violence galvanizes the people in the colonial present and reinvigorates specters of the colonial past. Stephen thus becomes an Irish revolutionary who challenges the colonial reality of Ireland by
inciting the violence necessary for decolonization. Fanon says, “But it so happens that for the colonized this violence is invested with positive, formative features because it constitutes their only work. This violent praxis is totalizing since each individual represents a violent link in the great chain, in the almighty body of violence rearing up in reaction to the primary violence of the colonizer” (my emphasis, 50). Episode 15 thus depicts how Stephen rears up against the colonial regime and works to shape the potential of a wholly new and separate reality outside the colonial world.
While viewing Stephen as “a violent link in the great chain, in the almighty body of violence,” I would like to take the image of Stephen as a part of a whole further. We have seen that Stephen’s heteroglossia is sociopolitical and heterogeneous in nature. Furthermore, we have seen how the atmospheric effect of violence that can lead to decolonization stems from Stephen’s own moment of liberatory violence. Thus, I believe that Stephen’s dialogic and violent subversion of the nationalist and colonial regimes constructs Stephen as gateway to imagining a heterogeneous and antinational community.

Anderson explains how the concept of a “nation” is really like that of an “imagined community” of people. He says that the nation is better understood as an “imagined political community – imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (6). He explains that it is imagined because in any political community, large or small, it is highly unlikely that an individual will know every other member of the community, thus there is an imaginary belief in the simultaneous and anonymous existence of other members (6). The community is of course limited in that it cannot be infinite, or incorporate every individual in existence. It is rather defined by its limited population set in opposition to the limited populations of other nations (6). The nation as an imagined community is sovereign, or like a sovereign state because the very concept of the nation
comes at the decline of dynasticism (7). Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, he describes a community as a group in which its members share a fraternal interest in their community, even that they may be willing to die for the perseverance of their community (7).

Jonathan Culler’s article “Anderson and the Novel” helps to identify how it is that Anderson believes the novel in particular works in imagining a community of the nation. He explains that the novel acts as an analogue for the nation by imagining a community that has the potential to become a nation. He places great significance on the idea that the imagined community found in the novel is more productively seen as a potential for a nation rather than a direct representation of a nation. He does so because he is wary of critics who may extend Anderson’s argument too far by positing that any traditional novel always imagines a community in its pages and through its readership that represents a nation. Culler’s article acts as a cautionary directive of how to understand and apply Anderson’s theory of the novel as an analogue, rather than a direct representation of the novel. He stipulates that the novel must then exhibit Anderson’s concept of “homogeneous, empty time” (that Anderson borrows from Benjamin’s *Illustrations*), or what can be more commonly understood as a synchronic chronology measured by the clock and calendar (Anderson 24). The novel traditionally depicts this through “a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogenous, empty time” and “he has complete confidence in [other sociological organisms’] steady, anonymous, simultaneous activity” (Anderson 26).
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17 Culler explains that when Anderson refers to traditional, or “old-fashioned novels” that this includes any novel in which the narrator is not a character and the narrative is not filtered through the consciousness or position of a single observer (23).
In this way, it is not difficult to see how *Ulysses* as a novel functions as an analogue to a nation. The narrational technique and narrative structure is so varied that it cannot be construed as being entirely “filtered through the consciousness or position of a single observer” thereby falling within Anderson’s parameters. Moreover, whether you focus on Bloom or Stephen, they both represent a sociological organism traveling calendrically or synchronically (hour by hour) throughout their day in the bustling city of Dublin where there is no doubt of the massive simultaneous existence of other sociological organisms going about their business entirely unknown and anonymously to that of Bloom or Stephen. *Ulysses*’ unique dual narrative trajectory that follows Bloom and Stephen throughout their day (on June 16th, 1904) provides an interesting, even problematic way of viewing how the novel imagines a community, or communities that could be read as an analogue to a nation. Certain problems that arise would be whether the communities that Bloom and Stephen imagine are separate and distinct from one another? Or, perhaps, once Bloom and Stephen cross paths during and after episode 14, or thereafter 10pm, can they be seen as imagining one community between the two of them? With such blatant dissimilar political beliefs between the two, can it even be argued that Bloom and Stephen would consider themselves as members of one imagined political community? What would the politics of this singular community be? National? Antinational? Utopian?

I would argue that because *Ulysses* exhibits the homogeneous empty time of both Stephen and Bloom separately for the majority of the novel and that they retain and espouse clearly dissimilar political beliefs as well as ethnic backgrounds that influence their own self-identifications and psychologies, that the community, or communities
imagined by the two characters can be treated as separate analogues of a potential nation. My concern then is with how Stephen imagines a community. Anderson reminds us that, “Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined” (6) and that “the most important thing about language is its capacity for generating imagining communities” (133). Thus, I believe that the “style” of Stephen’s heteroglossic language that rejects the colonial regime and subverts the nationalists’ homogenizing efforts shows that Stephen can be understood as “generating,” or imagining a heterogeneous, *anticolonial*, and *antinational* community.

In contrast, Enda Duffy argues that Stephen’s discourse within the context of the “Telemachiad” imagines a heterogeneous *national* community. Duffy looks at the discourses of Stephen, Buck Mulligan, Haines as well as other artistic modes in the “Telemachiad” in order to argue that they are “nationalist” because they are derivative of imperial colonialist modes. He says, “*The principal derivative narratives toyed with and discarded in the opening of Ulysses are the familiar ones of nationalism* and ressentiment; the primary principle of a nonsectarian community developed in the course of the first three episodes is that of the possibility of imagining different kinds of human subjects existing and acting simultaneously in a complex yet full imagined space” [my emphasis 26]. I do not dispute that the first three episodes “*imagin[e] different kinds of human subjects existing and acting simultaneously in a complex yet full imagined space*” and that this successfully helps to constitute an imagined community. However, I greatly dispute that Stephen’s discourse is proven to be derivative of nationalist discourse and as such he imagines a *national* community.
Duffy formulates a Fanonian argument that says bourgeois nationalism inevitably reproduces imperial discourse. Duffy intimates the double bind of nationalism: its opposition to colonialism on the one hand, but on the other its reproduction of many of colonialism’s oppressive mechanisms. David Lloyd more clearly states, “Even in its oppositional stance, nationalism repeats the master narrative of imperialism, the narrative development which is always applied with extreme rigor and priority to colonized people” (*Anomalous States* 54).

Ultimately, Duffy concludes that Stephen’s discourse is a nationalist discourse derived from colonial master narratives and as such is a form of mimicry. He says, “The mimic discourse Stephen invokes that parallels the alienation he himself experiences as a misunderstood artist is Irish nationalism” (38). He says Stephen’s mimicry functions as a “representation of the nationalist ethos [and] evolves into a formal expose of that nationalism as an exercise in mimicry” (40). Lastly, he argues that *Ulysses* intentionally “exposes” Stephen’s nationalist mimicry as an ineffectual “discourse that, as it is a symptom of colonial oppression, can only mimic it, and as such is inadequate to fashion an alternative independent version of an Irish state” (52).

I argue to the contrary on two fronts: mimicry is not merely meant to show how bourgeois nationalism is derivative nor is mimicry subsequently ineffectual; and Stephen’s discourse is not nationalist. Duffy undervalues the significance of mimicry when used by the colonized, and generally mischaracterizes Stephen’s discourse to be derivative when it is more significantly understood to be heteroglossic.

Homi Bhabha writes extensively on mimicry and its use by the colonial hybrid. He explains in his essay “Signs Take for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and
Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817” that “The display of hybridity—its peculiar ‘replication’—terrorizes authority with the ruse of recognition, its mimicry, its mockery” (my emphasis 157). Stephen is certainly a hybrid marked by his conflicting affinities to the Catholic Church (represented by his namesake Saint Stephen) and his artistic inventiveness (represented by his last name Dedalus). Stephen’s heteroglossia, in Bakhtinian terms, is a form of “comic, ironic or parodic discourse” and therefore is a “double-voiced” discourse, or a form of mimicry, in that it is “another’s speech in another’s language” (324). More specifically, in episode 15, Stephen’s speaks in English to the English soldiers (thus he uses “another’s language,” as opposed to Gaelic) in a “speech type” of (ironic) colonial discourse about England and its soldiers being Stephen’s (Ireland’s) guests (Ulysses 15.4371-4372). Thus, Duffy fails to appreciate that Stephen’s heteroglossic mimicry “terrorizes authority” (“Signs” 157) through its dialogic and ironic subversion of the colonial authority through the colonist’s own language. Furthermore, its heterogeneity of using the English language in an ironic and parodic manner that creates a double-voicedness violates the “monologic desire of cultural nationalism” (Lloyd 89), particularly that of the Young Ireland movement and the Gaelic League that insist on the use of the Gaelic language. Duffy undervalues the postcolonial sociopolitical subversion, recalcitrance, and centrifugal properties inherent to heteroglossia, or what he simply understands as mimicry. Stephen’s heteroglossic discourse demonstrates a heterogeneous (rather than derived) style and produces a multivocality that violates any and all attempts to orient it as nationalist. Remembering that Anderson insists the ‘style’ of an imagined community is what distinguishes it and that language is what ‘generates’ the community, I argue that Stephen’s anticolonial,
antinational, and heterogeneous style of his language is precisely what imagines an anticolonial and antinational community. This is significant because this coincides with Stephen’s credo, non-serviam. Duffy doesn’t address why Stephen would cry out consistently non-serviam yet be guilty of reproducing imperialist discourse in tune with Irish nationalism. Rather, I believe it to be clear that Stephen rejects the British and the Irish nationalists and any other oppressive force that seeks to homogenize him. Thus, by viewing his discourse as heteroglossic, we can see that his political credo is reified explicitly in his discourse, implicitly through its style, and imaginatively in the community that it generates. There remains the question of who are the members of Stephen’s community and what fraternal interest it is that they share. I answer by revisiting Culler who reminds us that an imagined community can be constituted through its opposition, rather than through its constituents. He says, “[when applying Anderson’s theory to a novel], if we argue that the novel was a condition of possibility for imaging something like a nation, for imagining a community that could be opposed to another, as friend to foe, and thus a condition of possibility of a community organized around a political distinction between friend and enemy, then we are on less dubious ground” (37). Stephen’s community is then not necessarily defined by its members, but by its opposition to the colonialist community and to the nationalist community. Stephen’s credo then becomes the credo for his community, opposition to any intrusive, external force: colonial, political, religious, or otherwise. As for its members, Stephen is not a complete recluse. He maintains friendships (Buck, Haines, even Bloom), thinks of his family often, works as a teacher schooling young children, and studies under professors as a graduate student. He demonstrates throughout Ulysses an active capacity for
intrapersonal relationships and communal ties. Therefore, it is not illogical to think that even with a personal and communal credo of non-serviam that Stephen would allow for other members to take part in his rejection of colonial and national institutions.

I would like to extend my perspective on Stephen’s role in imagining a community. In order to do so, I will examine how Vincent Cheng critiques how an imagined community can often be understood as championing homogeneity. However, in keeping with the heterogeneous ‘style’ of Stephen’s hybrid constitution as the colonial intellectual as well as the heterogeneous style of his discourse, I will argue in response to Cheng that a community imagined by Stephen would in fact embrace heterogeneity.

Cheng discusses how the “national character” discussed in *Imagined Communities* is arbitrary and homogeneous. He writes:

> In such a perspective, the idea of “nation” leads to the discursive reification of a rather arbitrary and homogeneous collection of different people(s) over a wide expanse of territory, a notion that thus – in the process which Anderson calls “imagining the nation” and which Homi Bhabha calls “writing the nation” – writes out (erases) difference and the realities of a pluralistic and culturally diverse “contact zone” (to use Mary Pratt’s term), so as to establish an essentialized (but largely imaginary) “national character.” […] As a result, the nation becomes a totalized version of the universal-particular, an attempt to universalize individual difference, to homogenize heterogeneity. [194]

I would argue that if Stephen is viewed as representative of the “national character”—the individual form in which the national order of things is often imagined—
then he cannot be considered “essentialized.” Stephen is a hybrid constantly at war with his divided nature towards the life of an artist and that of a devout, family-oriented Catholic. He is an intellectual, but from the lower-class and is the only man to actually fight in *Ulysses*. He’s a Jesuit who openly disavows his faith. He is neither an adolescent youth, nor too old limited by the reality of obligation. Stephen is a precipice between all fronts, and ideologies, only able to consistently claim non-serviam. He rails against colonialism and dissents from any nationalist alignment. His heterogeneous constitution prevents his labeling as any one particular constituent or class of national, or for that matter subaltern character. If Stephen is viewed as the “national character” of an imagined community then I argue that the “national character” would no longer seek to “homogenize heterogeneity” (194). Rather, it would embrace heterogeneity and an unprecedented inclusivity.

Cheng goes on to critique the concept of “unisonance” as another homogenizing characteristic within the imagined community. He writes:

The effect of such an imagined national character and community is, in Anderson’s term, “unisonance”: “Singing the Marseillaise, Waltzing Matilda, and Indonesia Raya provide occasions for unisonality, for the echoed physical realization of the imagined community” - when, perhaps, in truth “Nothing connects us all but imagined sound” (*Imagined Communities*, 145). The composite reality of, say, “France,” in the full range of its internal cultural/ethnic/individual heterogeneity and difference, may not be very much different from the corresponding heterogeneous ranges and realities of any (not purely tribal) nation –
whether Indonesia, Algeria, Australia, the United States, Canada, and so on. It is the tragedy of the unisonant, monologic perspective that is blind to the pluralism, heterogeneity, and multivalence of perspectives available—even within one’s own nation. It is for this reason that Joyce’s representation of nationalistic xenophobia and chauvinistic myopia through the trope of the one-eyed Cyclops is such a brilliantly effective and resonant choice. [my emphasis 197]

As an additional note to Cheng’s except, Anderson uses the example of a “national anthem” as a form of unisonance (145).

I agree with Cheng that unisonance in concert with the national character creates a homogeneity within an imagined community in that it values a “universal-particular,” as Cheng says (194). However, I believe the injection of a folk ballad like the Croppy Boy (who appears in episode 15) is the closest we come to the singing of a national anthem in Ulysses (it is sung by Ben Dollard in the tavern in episode 11) and that it violates the homogeneity of unisonance. Lloyd notes above that folk ballads, or street ballads “often achieve an effect akin to montage in which the contours of an heterogeneous [sic] and hybridized culture can become apparent without necessarily losing political force. Indeed, a large part of the pleasure of the street ballad is political and lies in its use of ‘extravagant allegories’: what it exploits is precisely the unevenness of knowledge that characterizes the colonized society” (99). The Croppy Boy appears in episode 15 and helps to represent the “heterogeneous and hybridized culture” that defines the divided Irish people. He appears ostensibly to sympathize with Stephen’s polemic against the colonial regime and his burgeoning fight with Private Carr. Moreover, as a street ballad,
the “Croppy Boy” explicitly denounces the cruelties perpetrated against the Irish, like the peasant croppie boy, by the English soldiers. It then seems fair to say that Stephen and the Croppy Boy share a polemic that in itself that stands in contrast to Bloom’s more moderate politics of economic and social cooperation between Ireland and England: thus, evidencing a microcosm of the divided Irish culture. Also, as is the nature of street ballads, it is unofficially passed down from generation to generation via familial and communal relations. It is derived from an oral tradition that invariably leads to multiple versions, thus violating the official unisonance of something like a state sponsored national anthem. Thus, I believe that the Croppy Boy represents what I would call a “multisonality” in Ulysses because it represents a “hybridized culture” (rather than homogenized) and because it is sung at different times and never by more than one person at a time (by the croppy himself in “Circe” and by Ben Dollard in “Sirens”). Its multisonality complements the heterogeneous hybridity of Stephen, Stephen’s multivocal heteroglossia, and the divided Irish culture at large. I argue then that Stephen’s heterogeneous “national character” in concert with the “multisonality” of the Croppy Boy help to imagine a heterogeneous Irish community without any partisan (nationalist) affiliation. Stephen is the active force behind the liberatory violence and its atmospheric effect that manifests a heterogeneous group or community of individuals, like the Croppy Boy, that share a fraternal interest in freedom from oppression without partisan politics. This heterogeneous, anticolonial, and antinational community creates a new potential, a new polity in Ireland. One that does not seek to homogenize, control, or segregate its

---

18 Anderson says in Imagined Communities that the unisonance of many people singing national songs like a national anthem at the same time “provide occasions for unisonality” (145).
own constituents’ language, values, cultural influences, or religious beliefs; however, it seeks only to embrace the revolutionary potential for a linguistically, culturally, and politically diverse Irish Free State.
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