HOME IS WHERE THE PLUMP MELLOW YELLOW SMELLOW MELLONS OF HER RUMP ARE: GEORG SIMMEL'S SOCIOLOGY AND THE IDEA OF HOME IN *ULYSSES*

Master Thesis

English Language and Culture

Leiden University

By

Richard van Rooijen

1446487

Date: September 12, 2017

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. P.T.M.G. Liebregts

Second reader: Dr. J.F. van Dijkhuizen

Table of contents

Introduction

According to Henry David Thoreau in *Walden,* "Man want[s] a home, a place for warmth, or comfort, first of physical warmth, then the warmth of the affections" (27). As this statement makes clear, a home is considered much more than merely a place to stay, and the concept of home has been an important subject throughout the ages. The idea of home is also central to both Homer's *Odyssey* and James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922). Odysseus making his way back home to Ithaca can be juxtaposed to Leopold Bloom making his way back to 7 Eccles Street in Dublin. However, while Homer's *Odyssey* seems to revolve more around the issue of journeying home, Joyce's *Ulysses* questions the very concept of home. The whole novel seems to revolve around what a sense of home actually is; home as a nation, as religion, or simply, home as fitting in and being accepted. When does something become a home? Is the idea of home related to rules, regulations and a geographical position in the world or can it simply even be someone's posterior? The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines home as: "The place where one lives or was brought up, with reference to the feelings of belonging, comfort, etc., associated with it." These feelings of belonging seem to fit in with Joyce's concept of home that he tries to circumscribe in *Ulysses.* The novel deals with the concept of home on different levels, where Leopold Bloom, as a second generation Hungarian Jew in Ireland, is the epitome of homelessness. Furthermore, not only does the story of *Ulysses* deal with the idea of home, but also the change of writing style in each chapter of *Ulysses* can be seen as a search for a style that feels familiar both for the reader and writer. One of Joyce's main focuses in *Ulysses,* however, seems to be Dublin society. Bloom and Stephen Dedalus have divergent personalities that clash with the ideas and behaviour of the average Dubliners. Their interactions with the Dubliners provide an image of the Dublin society of the early twentieth century.

Georg Simmel (1858-1918), a German philosopher, sociologist, and contemporary of Joyce, is considered as one of the first sociologists who tried to analyse the idea of society. Simmel, similar to Bloom in *Ulysses*, houses three main branches of religion in himself. Simmel was born into an assimilated Jewish family. His father converted to Catholicism and Georg Simmel was baptized as a Protestant as a child. Furthermore, Simmel experienced anti-Semitic treatment, just like Bloom, while teaching at Berlin University (*On Individuality* x). Simmel spent most of his career at the Berlin University lecturing and writing without having a regular faculty appointment (*On Individuality* x). Simmel's ideas and observations on society will be used in this thesis as a framework to see how Joyce tackles the problematic idea of home. Simmel's work contains concepts that frequently return in *Ulysses,* such as the stranger who tries to find his or her own place in a new environment, and the link between a metropolis and mental life. Furthermore, Simmel wrote a great deal about domination. He discusses, for instance, domination under a plurality, which is a concept that is highly relevant for Ireland that was dominated by the British state and the Catholic Church at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Even though much has been written about Joyce and *Ulysses,* there is still a gap when it comes to a detailed analysis of the concept of home represented in *Ulysses.* Therefore, this thesis will analyse how James Joyce questions the concept of home in *Ulysses,* using Georg Simmel's work in sociology as a referential framework. Furthermore, the relevance of this study also ties in with recent global developments. The large stream of Middle-Eastern refugees and recent terrorist attacks have created a hostile environment for Middle-Eastern looking people because of a stereotypical image. The stereotypical image of a terrorist–a bearded Middle-Eastern–has sparked an attitude of aversion and aggression towards Middle-Eastern looking people and the Islamic religion, an attitude that can be compared to the treatment of Bloom and the outsider's view on Jewish religion in *Ulysses.* In *Ulysses*, Joyce's

Dublin includes a series of anti-Semitic characters that represent the nationalistic attitude of that time in Ireland. Bloom and Stephen's struggle to belong, seem now as relevant as when Joyce wrote *Ulysses*.

This thesis will first focus on Leopold Bloom and Simmel's concept of "the stranger," then will continue with Stephen and Simmel's work on subordination and superordination, and, lastly, will focus on Dublin and Simmel's work on mental life in the metropolis.

1. Leopold Bloom, the Stranger

This chapter will focus on Leopold Bloom as "the stranger," to use Simmel's term. Adam Woodruff points out that in *Ulysses* there are certain ways of national identification which allow only certain citizens to feel at home while others cannot (277). Woodruff claims that in this way Joyce comments on how Irish nationalism "installs its own hegemonic myth of origins" (277). This chapter will show how Bloom is not able to feel at home in Dublin, and I will do so by applying Simmel's concept of the stranger.

Simmel explains that the stranger shares a lot of similarities with the wanderer–a person that is not attached to a certain group, or area–but that they are not the same, as the wanderer comes and goes, whereas the stranger comes and stays in a certain place (*On Individuality* 143). The stranger becomes "fixed within a certain spatial circle–or within a group whose boundaries are analogous to spatial boundaries" (*On Individuality* 143). Even though the stranger does become part of a group or spatial circle, he becomes one of the group's "inner enemies," because his position in the group "is fundamentally affected by the fact that he does not belong in it initially and that he brings qualities into it that are not, and cannot be, indigenous to it" (*On Individuality* 143). Furthermore, Simmel claims that even though the stranger can be "attractive and meaningful in many ways," the stranger will never be treated as a true member of the group (*On Individuality* 145). Even though the traits and qualities that the group members have in common are general qualities that the stranger often shares with the group, the group fails to recognise these shared common traits in the stranger (*On Individuality* 146). Furthermore, strangers are not treated or perceived as individuals, Simmel claims, but treated as a certain type due to their "alien origin" (*On Individuality* 148). Bloom, for example, is not seen as an individual, but due to his Jewish heritage, is seen, and treated as, a stereotypical Jew.

Even though the stranger is part of a group, he has qualities that make him both an insider as well as an outsider in relation to the group. This introduces another important part of Simmel's concept of the stranger, namely the stranger's "distinctly 'objective' attitude" towards the group (*On Individuality* 145). The idea of the stranger being both inside and outside of a group, gives him a unique position that is composed of "remoteness and nearness, indifference and involvement" (*On Individuality* 145). The stranger's objectivity comes from the fact that his mind works according to his own rules and conditions that may provide him with a different view on things as opposed to the views from "original" members of the group (*On Individuality* 145-46). The stranger's own rules and conditions most probably differ from "original" group members because the stranger was born and raised somewhere else, or with a different set of customs. Furthermore, this entails that the stranger is able to give an objective view of the group because he has no emotional ties to it (*On Individuality* 146). Simmel considers the objective view of the stranger to be a form of freedom and considers him to be a freer man: the stranger "examines conditions with less prejudice; he assesses them against standards that are more general and more objective; and his actions are not confined by custom, piety, or precedent" (*On Individuality* 146).

In *Ulysses,* Leopold Bloom does not see himself as a stranger or foreigner, but considers himself to be Irish. "Ireland my country," Bloom thinks in the 'Aeolus' episode, affirming his Irish nationality (150). Bloom, however, never gets treated as Irish due to his foreign background, as he is the son of a Hungarian Jew, Rudolf Virág, and of an Irish Protestant woman, Ellen Higgins, while he only converted to Catholicism in order to marry Marion (Molly) Tweedy. Even though Bloom converted to Catholicism, the dominant religion in Ireland, he is not accepted by the Irish nor does he feel at home. Furthermore, most of the Dubliners do not seem to know him very well or want to know him. Not only is Bloom a

stranger to the Dubliners, at one point in the novel he even becomes an actual stranger in his own house as his wife has rearranged the furniture in his house.

Throughout the novel Bloom is first and foremost seen as a Jew, even though he himself claims he is not Jewish (745). Morton P. Levitt, however, claims Bloom is a Jew and this this is the key to his identity (146). In Bloom, Levitt claims, Joyce created the "archetypal Modernist figure, the man whose history, attitude, condition come to represent all of humanity in the twentieth century," and Bloom had to ironically be "the ancient, ultimate outsider in Western life," that is, Jewish (Levitt 146-47). Bloom struggles with the fact that he has no "true identity" as he is seen as a stranger everywhere he goes. He seems to have a longing to feel a sense of home and acceptance.

Furthermore, Bloom cannot be seen as the conventional male figure. Kiberd even claims he is the "enemy of patriarchy" (Joyce 990) as he seems to be in touch with his feminine side, something the Dubliners seem to lack. His wife, Molly, seems to like him for this very reason as she claims in the final chapter of the novel: "I liked him because he understood or felt what a woman is" (932). Bloom constantly tries to approach things from different perspectives, even from the perspective of his cat, for example: "Wonder what I look like to her. Height of a tower? No, she can jump me" (66). Furthermore, Bloom has an extensive interest in the minds of people and how they deal with desires. The example with the cat, for instance, can also be interpreted as Bloom's insecurity wondering how his wife Molly sees him.

Bloom's divergent personality is an element which does not fit in Simmel's description of the stranger. Although there might be some points of commonalities between Bloom and the Dubliners, such as him being relatively poor just like the rest of his companions, the overarching differences between the Dubliners and Bloom are clearly visible. Even though Bloom is allowed in the inner circle, he does not get accepted as a Dubliner. This

first becomes clear in the 'Hades' episode. The episode deals with the funeral of Patrick Dignam, and the carriage ride towards the funeral shows the relationship between Bloom and his 'fellow' Dubliners. When, during the carriage ride, they pass Elvery's elephant house, a pawn shop, Martin Cunningham says "We have all been there," and continues by looking at Bloom and saying "Well, nearly all of us" (Joyce 117). The stereotypical image of the money-hungry Jew is invoked here as it is assumed Bloom is rich and stingy with his money. Furthermore, Bloom has a "sudden eagerness" to speak that implies his nervousness when confronted with anti-Semitic innuendos (Joyce 117). Simmel's concept of the stranger fits here with the Dubliners' treatment of Bloom because instead of the Dubliners seeing him as a person with his own traits, he is treated as a stereotypical Jew. Furthermore, even though he is allowed to ride with the "inner-circle" in the carriage, he is not part of it. As the carriage ride progresses, Bloom gets treated more and more as an outsider, as his words are being cut off and ignored several times:

> They were both on the way to the boat and he tried to drown…
> —Drown Barabbas! Mr Dedalus cried. I wish to Christ he did!
> Mr Power sent a long laugh down his shaded nostrils.
> —No, Mr Bloom said, the son himself….
> Martin Cunningham thwarted his speech rudely.
> …
> —Yes, Mr Bloom said. But the funny part is…
> —And Reuben J., Martin Cunningham said, gave the boatman a florin for saving his son's life. (Joyce 117-18)

Bloom's eagerness to be part of the group is seen here, as he chooses to ignore the harassment of the Dubliners. Furthermore, it becomes painfully clear that Martin Cunningham seems to be the only one who knows anything about Bloom when the conversation turns to the subject of suicide: "But the worst of all, Mr Power said, is the man who takes his own life …, They say a man who does it is a coward, Mr Dedalus said" (Joyce 120). Bloom's father committed suicide and the only one who knows this is Martin Cunningham, once again a sign of how Bloom is the foreign and unknown outsider. Cunningham tries to divert from the

subject by coughing and defending the matter of suicide for it might be a tough subject for Bloom. Bloom appreciates the gesture and thinks about Cunningham: "Sympathetic human man he is. Intelligent. Like Shakespeare's face. Always a good word to say" (120). Ironically, as it was Cunningham who was the one who made the comment about Bloom and the pawn shop earlier, Bloom's view on him again shows his eagerness to be accepted and see the good side of people. The problem, however, lies not with Bloom's behaviour but his foreign background, according to Simmel. A stranger is treated like one because there is no way for him to become indigenous. Furthermore, what seems to be lacking, according to Karen R. Lawrence, is a sense of hospitality the Dubliners are not giving Bloom, and that he needs to feel at home with them. According to Lawrence, hospitality involves "conventions of welcoming the other into the sanctuary of the home under certain laws and understood pacts" (Lawrence 153). This hospitality is something Bloom has never received, and, according to Simmel, will never receive, from his fellow Dubliners, which makes it impossible for him to feel at home and become an insider. Even when Bloom tries to do a nice thing at the funeral by mentioning that Menton's hat is a bit crushed, his kindness is misinterpreted as an insult (146-47). The trilby hat in the 1890s was seen as a symbol of male authority to give men extra height, and a dented hat could be regarded as a symbol of crushed male authority (Joyce 989). Bloom's comment, therefore, might be seen as an insult or act of revenge, as Menton is possibly a former lover of Bloom's wife, Molly (Joyce 990).

Even though the Dubliners at Dignam's funeral fail to see Bloom in a positive light, there are some characters who do see Bloom's foreignness as attractive. Gerty McDowell, for instance, in the 'Nausikaa' episode, feels an attraction towards Bloom as they ogle each other from a distance. She especially notices his eyes:

> Yes, it was her he was looking at and there was meaning in his look. His eyes burned into her as though they would search her through and through, read her very soul. Wonderful eyes they were, superbly expressive, but could you trust them? People were so queer. She could see at once by his dark eyes and his

> pale intellectual face that he was a foreigner, matinée idol, only for the moustache which she preferred… (Joyce 465)

Gerty acknowledges Bloom as a foreigner but does not consider this as a threat; on the contrary, she sees it as rather exotic. Gerty diverts here from the general Dubliners who consider Bloom as an invading foreigner and, therefore, a threat. Gerty fixates on Bloom's "dark eyes", and his foreign roots have no negative connotations for her (471). Even though this may only be to fulfil her romantic fantasy, the attraction of the stranger Simmel writes about is clearly visible. Gerty seems to ascribe attributes to Bloom, the foreigner, that suit her needs. However, she gets all her knowledge from the romantic books she has read, not personal experience. This is in a sense what Edward Said describes in his work *Orientalism*, in which he argues that Orientalist stereotypes were often based on biased research or sightings interpreted from a Western perspective. The problem, Said claims, is that the Oriental is represented and controlled by dominating frameworks (40). According to Said, Orientalism should be seen as imposing restrictions upon thought that prevent us from forming a nuanced view (42). He describes the Orient[1] as "almost an European invention, which had been since antiquity, a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences" (Said 1). However, Orientalist views were presented and used as objective truths by those in power (Said 36). As such, the image formed of the (Jewish) 'Other' was created with the intention of creating an inferior image in order to exploit them. The created negative image of the 'Jewish Other' is very much present in *Ulysses* as will be discussed in the analysis of Bloom's encounter with the Citizen and Stephen's discussion with Mr Deasy. Gerty McDowell also seems to be creating an image for the foreign-looking Bloom. She asserts meaning to Bloom's appearance to fit her own agenda. The difference, however, is that Gerty's image is positive and not intended to attribute any

[1] The Orient is the combined name for the constructed image of the East which consists of Asia, Middle Eastern countries, and Polynesia.

inferior or negative characteristics to Bloom. Her image is fuelled by the romantic books she has read and her situation of being unlikely to find a suitor due to the fact that she has a limp. This inability to find a suitor has turned her into a hopeless romantic that tries to find love from glancing at Bloom. Gerty's positive view of Bloom can be juxtaposed with the imperial colonizers, as they were actively attributing negative characteristics to the 'Other' based on their own biased interpretations.

The Orientalist tendency seems inescapable, as Bloom himself also has biased interpretations of the exotic East which becomes clear in one of his fantasies. In the 'Calypso' episode, Bloom dreams of escaping to an exotic country in the East, a dream that is filled with Orientalist presumptions:

> old Tweedy's big moustaches leaning on a long kind of spear. Wander through awned streets. Turbaned faces going by. Dark caves of carpet shops, big man, Turko the terrible, seated crosslegged smoking a coiled pipe. (68)

His Middle-Eastern fantasy even has bits of Ireland in them, as "Turbo the Terrible" was a pantomime production playing in Dublin in 1902 (68). Where Gerty seemed to hold on to her fantasy, Bloom, however, instantly realises his fantasy is probably incorrect because it is inspired by things he read, instead of things he has actually seen for himself: "Probably not a bit like it really. Kind of stuff you read: in the track of the sun" (68). Bloom's ability to see past his stereotypical fantasy shows his ability as a stranger to think outside the dominating views of the Dubliners. Bloom's hodgepodge background has given him a less prejudiced opinion and a way to see things from different angles. However, his background also makes him stand out with the Dubliners, making him the prototypical stranger Simmel wrote about.

Simmel's notion of the stranger's objective view becomes clearly visible in the 'Cyclops' episode where Bloom clashes with the Citizen. Bloom enters Barney Kiernan's pub where a group is drinking and having a discussion. Included in the group is the Citizen, whom Declan Kiberd describes as "the epitome of narrow nationalism" (Joyce 1057). The Citizen's

remarks are aimed at the British colonizers, claiming that everything civilised the Irish have, was stolen from them:

> –Their syphilisation, you mean, says the citizen. To hell with them! The curse of a goodfornothing God light sideways on the bloody thicklugged sons of whores' gets! No music and no art and no literature worthy of the name. Any civilisation they have they stole from us. Tonguetied sons of bastards' ghosts. (421)

The Citizen continues his rant about the violence the British use, and claims that the only way to get their beloved Ireland back is to use force against force (427). Kiberd notes that the nationalistic character of the Citizen made it possible for Joyce to show that the Irish nationalist ideas are very similar to the English ones which the Irish claim to oppose (Joyce 1057). Bloom responds by confronting the Citizen with the fact that he wants to use the same violence he just denounced in order to regain control of Ireland, thereby making him no better than the British he despises (427). As Bloom joins the discussion he becomes the Citizen's target for a series of anti-Semitic comments. The reason for the Citizen's hatred towards Bloom, Adam Woodruff claims, is that "Bloom embodies a decadent complicity and instability that must be expurgated so that a lost 'Golden Age' of Ireland lamented by the Citizen can be regained" (281). The Citizen believes that Ireland will automatically be restored to her former state with the expulsion of "the strangers" in his house. Bloom, as a foreigner, is seen by the Citizen as the problem and is therefore his enemy.

The way in which Bloom and the Citizen want to resolve their problems seems to be Joyce's general criticism of Irish nationalists. Bloom, who in the eyes of the Citizen is a Jew, lives his life more according to the Christian standard than the supposed Catholic Citizen. Bloom is a pacifist and says that the Citizen's way will only cause "[p]erpetuating hatred among nations" (430), when the Citizen wants to "put force against force" (427) against the British invaders. As Bloom continues his argument he truly shows his pacifist side:

> –But it's no use, says he. Force, hatred, history, all that. That's not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it's the very opposite of that that is real life.
> –What? says Alf.
> –Love, says Bloom. I mean the opposite of hatred. (Joyce 432)

Bloom acts as the voice of reason in the pub as he looks at the matter from not just an "Irish" perspective: "–Some people, says Bloom, can see the mote in others' eyes but they can't see the beam in their own" (422-23). Ironically, Bloom here cites the New Testament, something the Citizen fails to recognise: "–*Raimeis* [Gaelic for rubbish], says the citizen. There's no-one as blind as the fellow that won't see, if you know what that means" (423). The Citizen does not realise he is talking about himself being blind. Therefore, Bloom's speech of love not only opposes the Citizen's single-minded view, it also exposes the Citizen's failure to live according to his own religion. Bloom's idea is to 'love thy neighbour,' which, though mockingly said by John Wyse during the confrontation with Bloom and the Citizen, is one of the main messages of Christianity (Joyce 432). Bloom expands on his view of the world later in the novel in the 'Eumaeus' episode, when he is in conversation with Stephen Dedalus:

> –Of course, Mr Bloom proceeded to stipulate, you must look at both sides of the question. It is hard to lay down any hard and fast rules as to right and wrong but room for improvement all round there certainly is though every country, they say, our own distressful included, has the government it deserves. But with a little goodwill all round. It's all very fine to boast of mutual superiority but what about mutual equality? (745)

Joyce shows his criticism of Irish nationalism by turning the foreign Bloom into an exemplary Irish catholic. The Citizen, on the other hand, is very narrow-minded and blames all of Ireland's trouble on outsiders. The roles of stranger and native are, in a sense, reversed as the Citizen is estranged from his religion's ideology, whereas Bloom does convey the Christian idea of love.

As Bloom goes out to look for Martin Cunningham, the group at the bar continues to discuss Bloom. Once again it becomes apparent that he is not well-known, except by Martin Cunningham, or even wanted by the Dubliners:

> –Is he a jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? says Ned. Or who is he? No offence, Crofton.
> –We don't want him, says Crofter the Orangeman or Presbyterian. …
> He's a perverted jew, says Martin, from a place in Hungary…
> –Isn't he the cousin of Bloom the dentist? says Jack Power.
> –Not at all, says Martin. Only namesakes. His name was Virag. The father's name that poisoned himself. He changed it by deed poll, the father did. (438)

The Citizen even rejects the fact Bloom was born in Ireland: "–A wolf in sheep's clothing, says the Citizen. That's what he is. Virag from Hungary! Ahasuerus I call him. Cursed by God" (438-39). When Bloom returns to the bar, the situation escalates when Bloom cannot stand anymore of the Citizen's abuse. When the Citizen is making one anti-Semitic comment after another, Bloom responds with a fact the Catholic Citizen fails to see:

> –Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza. And the Saviour was a jew and his father was a jew. Your God.
> –He had no father, says Martin. That'll do now.
> Drive ahead.
> –Whose God? says the citizen.
> –Well, his uncle was a jew, says he. Your God was a jew. Christ was a jew like me. (444-45)

Bloom, in his act of heroism of standing up to the Citizen, puts him in his place, to which the Citizen has no other response than to curse and use violence. His aggression towards Bloom shows once more his single-mindedness and the hypocrisy of Irish nationalists. The Citizen, as the Odyssean Cyclops, can only see one side of the picture and refuses to look beyond his own (extreme) ideas.

The 'Circe' episode is an important chapter in the development of Bloom's character because this is where Bloom learns to accept his differences and use them to his advantage. This is important for his role as a stranger for it makes Bloom embrace his differences instead

of feeling bad about them. The 'Circe' episode takes place mostly in dream-like sequences. One of the dream-like sequences give a glimpse of how Bloom would like to see himself. Bloom imagines himself as the new messiah and saviour of Ireland, and dreams of how he would reform his homeland:

> Bloom: I stand for the reform of municipal morals and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem, and gentile. … No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state. (610)

Not only does Bloom's ideal world convey a message of love for all, it also reverts back to his scene with the Citizen in his remark on "patriotism of barspongers" (610). Even in his fantasy, however, Bloom realises that nationalistic Dubliners will be against his utopia that he dubs "Bloomusalem" (606). Bloom's mistreatment at the hand of his fellow Dubliners has given him low self-esteem, which, even in his fantasy, follows him in a negative fashion:

> Father Farley: He is an Episcopalian, an agnostic, an anythingarian seeking to overthrow our holy faith.
> Mrs Riordan: *(Tears up her will)* I'm disappointed in you! You bad man!
> Mother Grogan: *(Removes her boot to throw it at Bloom)* You beast! You abominable person! (611)

As his fantasy continues, an angry mob is prepared to lynch Bloom. The lynching, however, does not happen and is foiled due to an examination by Doctor Dixon. Dixon, after examining Bloom's urine, comes to the conclusion that Bloom is a "finished example of the new womanly man. His moral nature is simple and lovable" (614). As the doctor finishes his examination, he calls for mercy for Bloom because he is a "rather quaint fellow" (614). Bloom's fantasy shows his eagerness to be accepted by the Dublin community as well as his objective view of his predicament. The fantasy makes clear that Bloom wants to be accepted for who he is, even though he is a stranger. Bloom, however, seems to realise that the dream of being accepted is futile because of his divergent personality and heritage.

The ‘Circe’ episode is where Joyce shows that being different is not a bad thing and what the effects are of being treated as a stranger. Although Bloom seems to have lost all of his self-confidence because of the way he is treated, the scene in Bella Cohen’s brothel is at the same time a pivotal episode where Bloom regains his self-esteem and learns to accept his role of being different from the rest. Bloom, however, still has to hit rock bottom before he can regain his self-confidence. This happens in the ‘Circe’ episode when, during the fantasy, the “massive whoremisstress” Bella subjects Bloom to a masochistic session where Bella and Bloom switch genders (Joyce 641). Once again Bloom’s feelings towards how he is being treated as an outsider come forward in this fantasy: “Justice! All Ireland versus one!” (654). Bloom feels that he is being mistreated by all the Irish. Furthermore, the fantasy takes Bloom to his own funeral where his role of being a stranger among the Dubliners is shown once more:

> Voices: *(Sighing)* So he’s gone. Ah, yes. Yes, indeed. Bloom? Never heard of him. No? Queer kind of chap. (655)

People do not seem to know him at his own funeral or consider him an odd person, in other words, a stranger. Bloom is the stranger who is not known or understood because he has different values, just as Simmel describes in his work.

Bloom eventually regains control and snaps out of the fantasy as the ‘nymph’ he has been talking to claims that only the ethereal should exist:

> The Nymph:…No more desire. *(She reclines her head, sighing)* Only the ethereal. Where dreamy creamy gull waves o’ver the waters dull. *(Bloom half rises. His back trousers’ button snaps.)*
> …
> Bloom: *(Coldly)* You have broken the spell. The last straw. If there were only ethereal where would you all be, postulants and novices? Shy but willing, like an ass pissing. (661)

It is at this point that Bloom realises, after his discussions with the nymph in his fantasy, that there cannot be good without evil, or, as Kiberd states: “the Blakean doctrine that without

contraries there is no progression" (Joyce 1142). Bloom, having experienced "the other side" in Bella's masochistic sessions, learns to accept his quaintness and feminine side and immediately uses it to protect the drunk Stephen from being swindled by Bella. Kiberd notes that Bloom is now "mediating between male and female principles" as he escorts Stephen to a safer place (Joyce 1123). Bloom hereby becomes a hero by accepting his role of the stranger instead of ignoring it or seeing it as a bad thing. Bloom not only mediates and makes sure Stephen does not get swindled by Bella, he also takes care of Stephen in a motherly way:

> Bloom: Poetry. Well educated. Pity. *(He bends again and undoes the buttons of Stephen's waistcoat)* To breathe. *(He brushes the wood shavings from Stephen's clothes with light hands and fingers)* (702)

Even though Simmel's theory of the stranger is mostly seen here in the negative parts of the insecure Bloom, it also shows there is hope for the stranger Bloom as he learns to accept the differences instead of trying to fit in. Bloom, however, did have to suffer first to accept who he really is, yet he gradually realises there is no progression without contraries. This transformation not only makes him accept himself, it also eventually makes him realise what his home actually is. In the end Bloom learns that his feeling of belonging is being with his wife Molly:

> In what final satisfaction did these antagonistic sentiments and reflections, reduced to their simplest form converge?
>
> Satisfaction at the ubiquity in eastern and western terrestrial hemispheres, in all habitable lands and islands explored or unexplored (the land of the midnight sun, the islands of the blessed, the isles of Greece, the land of promise) of adipose posterior female hemispheres, redolent of milk and honey and of excretory sanguine and seminal warmth, reminiscent of secular families of curves of amplitude, insusceptible of moods of impression or of contraries of expression, expressive of mute immutable mature animality. (867)

As he kisses Molly's posterior he has finally found the feeling of home he was looking for throughout the novel. Bloom uses Biblical terms tied to his Jewish heritage such as "the land of promise" and "milk and honey," showing he found his personal Promised Land in Molly.

Furthermore, the Jewish imagery is connected to the feeling of exile, showing once more that Bloom has feels like an outcast in the Dublin community. By making Molly's behind Bloom's promised land, Joyce shows here that a home is much more than a certain nationality or certain set of rules to fit in. Home is where you can be yourself and not be judged by the fact that you do not fit in or have a different background, religion, or nationality. Home is where you are seen as the person you are, not a stranger.

Simmel's theory of the stranger argues that there is no possibility for a stranger to fully enter the inner circle. Even though there are characteristics that the stranger might have in common with the native community, he will more likely be treated as an inner enemy. Leopold Bloom is almost a perfect example of Simmel's stranger, the only difference being that he does not have a lot of things in common with the Dubliners. Bloom is a second generation Hungarian, born in Ireland, a Jew turned Protestant turned Catholic, with a feminine side that is not understood by the Dubliners. The attractiveness of a stranger that Simmel speaks of, comes forward in his interaction with Gerty McDowell, even though her attraction towards Bloom seems to be based on romanticized stereotypes she read about in novels. Molly, Bloom's wife, seems to be the only one who respects Bloom for who he is, a man who understands women. Bloom is troubled by the fact he is not able to feel at home in Dublin and is eager to be accepted, even if this means being insulted. Bloom, however, has his fill in his confrontation with the Citizen, where for the first time he stands up for himself. Simmel's idea of the stranger is clearly visible here as Bloom confronts the Citizen with the objective view a stranger can have. The Citizen, having made numerous anti-Semitic comments, gets put into place by Bloom as he comments on the Citizen's religion, noting that Christ, his God, was a Jew. Furthermore, Bloom is a pacifist and wants to spread a message of love, unlike the Citizen who would rather put force against force, making Bloom more of an Irish Catholic than the nationalistic Citizen. Even though this is the first time Bloom stands up

against the Dubliners, it is not until his confrontation with Bella Cohen that Bloom learns to accept his differences and regains his self-confidence. Bloom in the end learns to accept his differences and finds his promised land with his wife Molly. Joyce confronts the reader with assumptions and biases in existence in Ireland that can only be made visible by an outsider, or in Simmel's terms, a stranger, because they are ingrained in society. The Dubliners reject Bloom on the basis of his background, not his personality, just as Simmel described how the stranger will be seen, not as a person, but the stereotype he fits into. Ironically, the compassionate Bloom is more Irish than the Dubliners who treat him badly.

2. Stephen Dedalus, the Dominated

This chapter will focus on Simmel's work regarding subordination and superordination, and how this may be linked to Stephen Dedalus being dominated by the British state, the Catholic church, and his principles.

Simmel introduces the term domination as a form of interaction (*On Individuality* 96). He claims that a superordinate does not want his influence to completely determine the subordinate, but wants this determination to "act back upon him" (*On Individuality* 96). The desire of domination is fuelled by the practical function of it, which, according to Simmel, is not the exploitation of the dominated, but the "mere consciousness of this possibility" (*On Individuality* 96). The ultimate goal of domination, Simmel claims, is to "break the infernal resistance of the subjugated" (*On Individuality* 96). Furthermore, Simmel writes that even though the main goal is to sculpt someone to your will by breaking the infernal resistance, there still is a personal interest for the dominated person in a sense of exploiting his skills (*On Individuality* 96). The superordinate can only find out about these skills by showing some personal interest in the subordinate.

The subordinate is left with a considerable amount of personal freedom, according to Simmel, even in the cruellest and most oppressive cases of subordination (*On Individuality* 97). He writes that the subordinated always have the freedom to go against their oppressor but that they never realise this because the consequences are too dire to even consider:

> We merely do not become aware of it, because its manifestation would entail sacrifices which we usually never think of taking upon ourselves. (*On Individuality* 97)

According to Simmel, the only way a subordinate's freedom can be destroyed is in the case of direct physical violation (*On Individuality* 97-98). Furthermore, man has a "dual relation" with the idea of subordination (*On Individuality* 103). Man wants to be dominated, Simmel writes, in order to relieve himself of responsibility (*On Individuality* 103). However, man also

needs to oppose the leading power in order to attain "the right place in the life pattern of those who obey it" (*On Individuality* 104). The dual relation, therefore, gives man his relief of responsibility while being able to keep his sense of autonomy by opposing his leader (*On Individuality* 104).

Simmel writes that there are two ways of becoming a superordinate: with prestige or through authority (*On Individuality* 98). Authority, according to Simmel, is obtained in one of two ways. Either a super-individual power, such as a state or church, appoints someone and gives him the power of ultimate decision, or a person of superior strength or significance acquires an "overwhelming weight of his opinions, a faith, or a confidence which have the character of objectivity" (*On Individuality* 98-99). The authoritative person therefore attains his authority by means of his own reputation or a reputation gained by a super-individual power. The subordinated group, however, has to give this authority to the superordinate in a more or less voluntary way (*On Individuality* 99). Simmel writes that the voluntary way of becoming subordinate is due to the freedom the subordinated party has. The party either acknowledges the authority, or goes against it and faces the consequences. Furthermore, Simmel writes that "the very feeling of 'oppressiveness' of authority suggests that the autonomy of the subordinate party is actually presupposed and never wholly eliminated" (*On Individuality* 99).

Prestige, as opposed to authority, lacks the idea of a personality with an objective norm or power (*On Individuality* 99). Leadership by prestige is based on the strength and pure personality of the individual (*On Individuality* 99). Where authority allows friction between superordinate and subordinate, prestige can create unconditional followers from individuals and masses (*On Individuality* 99-100). Simmel writes that under prestige leadership, the subordinate party enjoys less freedom than with authority, even though it may not feel that way. Prestige leadership is based on a form of devotion of the leader that leaves no room to

criticise him, whereas the one with authority still has the opportunity to be criticised by the subordinate (*On Individuality* 100). However, the feeling of oppressiveness and freedom, Simmel claims, is often different between the two (*On Individuality* 100). Where authority gives a sense that power seems to be forced upon the subordinate and is inescapable, with prestige, the subordinated feel connected and impressed by the superordinate which creates unconditional followers out of them (*On Individuality* 100). The feeling of freedom, therefore, might be less with authoritarian leadership but is, in fact, less with prestige.

Simmel divides subordination into three different forms; subordination under a principle, plurality, or an individual (*On Individuality* 100-01). Subordination under an individual results in a decisive unification of the group; the leader of it is the embodiment of the group's will (*On Individuality* 101). Simmel compares this form to the way some religions create the feeling of a contractual relation to its leader, like Jesus Christ to Christians, for example (*On Individuality* 101). However, this means the group is unified under their God instead of kinship. The group becomes a group because a common ground is created for them in their leader, not because they had common grounds to begin with. The common identity of the group, therefore, is based on the rules of their leader, not the expression of an already existing group (*On Individuality* 102). The group seems to enjoy freedom, according to Simmel, but this freedom stays within the boundaries of a foundation created by its ruler (*On Individuality* 102).

The second form of subordination Simmel writes about is subordination under a plurality. According to Simmel, groups can be dominated by a "plurality or social collectivity" (*On Individuality* 108). The significance of the subordinate in such a construction is very uneven, Simmel writes (*On Individuality* 108). The subordinate is usually better situated under the rule of a larger collectivity than a smaller one. This is due to the fact that there is no personal exploitation or individual management when one is dominated by a larger

party (*On Individuality* 108). Simmel uses the example that India was under better care of the British state, than the smaller East-India Company (*On Individuality* 108). Where the British state used common rules and laws, the East-India Company developed personal interest in individuals and groups beneficial to their cause. There are cases, however, that prove otherwise, Simmel writes, because of the "character of objectivity" of a ruler (*On Individuality* 109). This character of objectivity means that the subordinate group is "governed according to the profoundly objective axiom of greatest advantages and least sacrifices possible" (*On Individuality* 110). The subordinate who needs "tenderness, altruism, and favour of the superordinate" will fare badly, while the subordinate who prefers "legality, impartiality, and objectivity" is better off being dominated by a plurality (*On Individuality* 110).

The character of objectivity, however, should mainly be seen as a negative aspect. According to Simmel, the character of objectivity gives room for an individual to "mask his own lust for gain and his brutality by maintaining that he only pursued the advantage of the totality" (*On Individuality* 110). This makes the individual disappear behind the totality, leaving the individual without a subjective voice (*On Individuality* 110-11). Simmel uses the English communal life as an example for showing the negative effects of the character of objectivity:

> It has been noted that English communal life has been characterized, throughout its history, by extraordinary justice towards persons and by equally great injustice towards groups. In view of the strong feeling for individual rights, it is only this second psychological peculiarity which accounts for the manner in which Dissenters, Jews, Irishmen, Hindus, and, in earlier periods, Scotchmen, have been treated. (*On Individuality* 111)

Subordination under a plurality, therefore, can be a dangerous system because it removes accountability from individuals. In both abstract masses, such as the church or a state, as well as in actual physical masses, the individual is deprived of "the calmness and autonomy of

reflection and action" (*On Individuality* 112). The voice of the individual drowns in the voices of the mass:

> In a crowd, therefore, the most ephemeral incitations often grow, like avalanches, into the most disproportionate impulses, and thus appear to eliminate the higher, differentiated and critical functions of the individual. (*On Individuality* 112)

The "higher qualities," Simmel writes, disappear and are replaced by the voice of the mass (*On Individuality* 112).

Lastly, Simmel writes about the individual ruled by a principle. This individual feels determined by the principle and is in no way able to influence or change the principle (*On Individuality* 113). Simmel writes that this form lacks the element of freedom due to the fact that there is no form of interaction such as the ability to rise against a ruler (*On Individuality* 113). The individual has to follow his principle because he is completely determined by it. Furthermore, if the individual is able to change his principle, he becomes determined by the new principle that replaces the old (*On Individuality* 114). Simmel writes that for the "modern, objective man who is aware of the difference between the spheres of spontaneity and of obedience," rule by principle is the more "dignified situation" (*On Individuality* 114). The principle functions as the "emanation of impersonal, uninfluenceable powers," which give the modern, objective man freedom to move between the boundaries of his principle (*On Individuality* 114).

According to Simmel, subordination under a principle can be seen as turning the voice of conscience into a set of social norms:

> All that society asks of its members–adaption and loyalty, altruism and work, self-discipline and truthfulness–the individual also asks of himself. … Society confronts the individual with precepts. (*On Individuality* 118)

These precepts consist of social norms and laws that reshape the individual "until the cruder and subtler means of compulsion are no longer necessary" (*On Individuality* 118). Due to the

"rigidity" of life laws cannot fully cover every situation possible (*On Individuality* 116). Therefore, according to Simmel, it is necessary for a person, such as a ruler, to fill the gap where the law fails. That person, however, also needs the law where he is inadequate (*On Individuality* 116). Subordination under a principle, in that sense, becomes a search for turning common morality into an ever-changing set of precepts.

Ireland at the beginning of the twentieth century can be seen, in regards to Simmel's theory, as subordinated under a plurality. Ireland was in the hands of the English state and the Catholic church. Stephen becomes a personification of Ireland as he is dominated by the British Haines and haunted by the ghost of his Catholic mother. Stephen, just like Bloom, becomes homeless as his house is invaded by the British Haines. The difference, however, is that Bloom is considered a foreign invader to his environment, while Stephen is the one being invaded by a foreigner. Stephen's home gets usurped by Buck Mulligan and his English friend Haines. Stephen already suspects Haines of trying to usurp his home when in conversation with Haines:

> He wants that key. It is mine, I paid the rent. Now I eat his salt bread. Give him the key too. All. He will ask for it. That was in his eyes. (24)

Even though it seems Stephen does not want to give up his key, he gives it to Mulligan without any resistance:

> –Give us that key, Kinch, Buck Mulligan said, to keep my chemise flat. Stephen handed him the key. Buck Mulligan laid it across his heaped clothes. (27)

Mulligan's excuse for getting the key to flatten his clothing is not questioned by Stephen, even though he knows they are after his key. This may be seen as an example of the dual relation men have with subordination that Simmel wrote about. Stephen might need the superordination of Haines and Mulligan in order to retain autonomy by being able to oppose them. Furthermore, in the 'Nestor' episode Stephen comments on the three nooses around his

neck which are the British state, Catholic church, and Mulligan. Stephen comments on the nooses, claiming he "can break them in this instant if I will" (36). This suggests that Stephen is letting himself be subordinated, which is in line with Simmel's idea of the dual relation of men with subordination.

Stephen's relation to Haines and Mulligan shows that Stephen is being personally exploited. Not only does Stephen's home get usurped by the two, Haines and Mulligan also use Stephen's money to go drinking:

> –I get paid this morning, Stephen said.
> –The school kip? Buck Mulligan said. How much? Four quid? Lend us one.
> –If you want it, Stephen said.
> –Four shining sovereigns, Buck Mulligan cried with delight. We'll have a glorious drunk to astonish the druidy druids. Four omnipotent sovereigns. (11)

Simmel's theory of subordination can be seen here as Stephen gets exploited for his value. Even though Stephen seems to be dominated, he, in accordance with Simmel's theory, still has a large amount of freedom. Haines' interest in Stephen's ideas and sayings show the personal interest a superordinate can have in its subjects: "I'm intended to make a collection of your sayings if you let me" (18). Stephen responds by asking if he will make any money out of it, to which Haines replies: "–I don't know, I'm sure" (18). Not only does this show the possible exploitation of a subordinate by his superordinate, it also shows Stephen's freedom to go against his superordinate. Stephen seems to realise he is getting exploited as he sees no hope of ever getting any money out of it:

> The problem is to get money. From whom? From the milkwoman or from him [Haines]. It's a toss up, I think.
> … I see little hope, Stephen said, from her or from him.

Where Haines can be seen as a representation of the British state, the milk-woman, although mockingly mentioned by Stephen, becomes a representation of Ireland. As Kiberd notes, she is called "poor old woman" by Stephen, which is an image closely tied to Ireland (15) (947). Stephen shows he has no faith in the British state or the Irish people. Furthermore, the milk-

woman is unable to understand Gaelic. When Haines speaks to her in Gaelic, the milk-woman replies "Is it French you're speaking, sir?" (15). Stephen's lack of trust in the milk-woman to bring her money and her inability to understand or speak Gaelic represent Ireland's lack of home-rule and a loss of cultural identity.

Simmel's character of objectivity is seen in Haines' behaviour. He hides behind the voice of the totality as an excuse for his actions towards Stephen. In a discussion with Stephen, Haines get confronted with the fact of the English domination of the Irish:

> –After all, I should think you are able to free yourself. You are your own master, it seems to me.
> –I am the servant of two masters, Stephen said, an English and an Italian.
> –Italian? Haines said. …
> –The imperial British state, Stephen answered, his colour rising, and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church. (24)

Haines' reply shows a feeling of dominance and superiority:

> –I can quite understand that, he said calmly. An Irishman must think like that, I daresay. We feel in England that we have treated you rather unfairly. It seems history is to blame. (24)

Haines' refusal to take responsibility for the treatment of the Irish and his blaming history, suggests that the Irish were meant to be subjected, according to Haines, and therefore inferior to the English. Furthermore, Haines hides his individual voice behind that of the totality like Simmel described in his theory.

Even though Stephen gets exploited and his house gets usurped, he shows that he is not defined by his superordinates. Stephen realises during his walk on Sandymount Beach in the 'Proteus' episode that he has lost the key to his house to Haines: "He has the key. I will not sleep there when this night comes" (55). However, Stephen realises that there is something more important that Haines and Mulligan did not get from him: "Take all, keep all. My soul walks with me, form of forms" (55). Stephen shows that there are more than physical objects which define a person and that his spirit has not been broken. According to Simmel's

theory, Stephen therefore is not entirely subordinated to Haines and Mulligan because the goal of domination is to shape a subordinate to a ruler's will.

In the 'Nestor' episode it becomes clear that, similar to Stephen, Mr Deasy also feels subordinated to a plurality. The difference between the two, however, is that Mr Deasy seems to follow his English ruler with what Simmel called prestige. Mr Deasy is the headmaster of the Dalkey school where Stephen is a teacher, and a representative of the British state and Catholic church, which becomes clear from the description of his office:

> On the sideboard a tray of Stuart coins, base treasure of a bog: and shall ever be. And snug in their spooncase of purple plus, faded, the twelve apostles having preached to all the gentiles: world without end. (35)

Mr Deasy is as proud as an Englishman because he has no debt:

> Do you know what is the pride of the English? Do you know what is the proudest word you will ever hear from an Englishman's mouth? …
> –I will tell you, he said solemnly, what is his proudest boast. *I paid my way. …*
> *–I paid my way. I never borrowed a shilling in my life.* Can you feel that? *I owe nothing.* Can you? (37)

Even though Mr Deasy is Irish, he seems to identify with his foreign ruler. Mr Deasy, therefore, can be seen as a subordinate who is completely shaped to the ideas of his superordinate which, according to Simmel, is the ultimate goal of domination. Furthermore, Mr Deasy shows a form of admiration for the British, which is very much in line with Simmel's idea of domination by prestige.

Even though Stephen claims to be a subordinate of both the English nation and the Catholic church, his actions show the characteristics of an individual subjected by a principle. First of all, he claims he is an example of "free thought" (23). When he is walking on Sandymount Beach in the 'Proteus' episode, for example, his thoughts are about a dog running towards him:

> A point, live dog, grew into sight running across the sweep of sand. Lord, is he going to attack me? Respect his liberty. You will not be master of others or their slave. (56)

Stephen believes the dog is a wild dog and should not be dominated or dominate. Domination does not seem to be a part of Stephen's principle. The dog, however, is not free but owned by a couple walking on the beach. As the dog enjoys its freedom to wander around, it stumbles upon the body of a dead dog which its owners do not tolerate him being around:

> –Tatters! Out of that, you mongrel.
> The cry brought him back to his master and a blunt bootless kick sent him unscathed across a spit of sand, crouched in flight. (58)

According to Simmel, physical violence is the only way to completely remove a subordinate's freedom, which has happened to the dog. Stephen's mistake in thinking the dog is free while it is completely dominated, shows how the Irish might have felt a sense of freedom under the rule of the British. However, in regards to Simmel's theory of subordination, the scene can be seen as a warning. Even though there is a sense of freedom, the desire of domination is to have consciousness of the possibility of exploiting the subordinated group. When a subordinated group or individual overreach in this freedom, the superordinate will have to remind the subordinate of its potential power.

Stephen's subordination under a principle is also visible in his relation to his mother. Stephen was unable to pray for his mother on her deathbed, which already shows he is being dominated by a principle. Even though it appears that Stephen refused his mother's request to pray for her on her deathbed, it is more likely he was unable to. In Simmel's theory of subordination under a principle, he writes that an individual is unable to go against his principle, because otherwise the individual is not ruled by it. Stephen being unable to pray for his mother, however, results in him being haunted by the ghost of his mother. Mulligan intensifies Stephen's feeling of guilt by saying Mulligan's aunt thinks Stephen killed his mother by not praying for her:

> –The aunt thinks you killed your mother, he said. …
> –You could have knelt down, damn it, Kinch, when your dying mother asked you, Buck Mulligan said. I'm hyperborean as much as you. But to think of your mother begging you with her last breath to kneel down and pray for her. And you refused. There is something sinister in you… (4)

Mulligan claims he is as much hyperborean like Stephen, which means, according to Kiberd's notes, they live to the full, "beyond the usual moral conventions" (Joyce 944). This means that Stephen lives beyond the usual moral conventions from that time, the Catholic principles, showing once more he follows his own principle. Mulligan, on the other hand, claims to be the same as Stephen but is unable to fully be determined by his principle. Therefore, according to Simmel, Mulligan is not subordinated under a principle because he does not completely follow it.

Stephen struggles with his principle by not being able to pray for his dying mother. He is haunted by the idea of having killed his mother which manifests in Stephen being followed by the ghost of his mother: "My familiar, after me, calling Steeeeeeeeeephen" (24). It is not until the 'Circe' episode that Stephen is able to confront the ghost of his mother:

> STEPHEN: (Choking with fright, remorse and horror) They said I killed you, mother. He offended your memory. Cancer did it, not I. Destiny. (681)

Stephen is not looking for forgiveness from his mother, but he wants to know if she still loves him: "STEPHEN: (eagerly) Tell me the word, mother, if you know how. The word known to all men" (602). The ghost of Stephen's mother, however, is fixated on Stephen having to repent and have Stephen turn to religion: "Repent, Stephen… Repent! O, the fire of hell! … Beware! God's hand!" (682). Stephen, however, once again sticks to his principle: "STEPHEN: Ah non, par example! The intellectual imagination! With me all or not at all. Non serviam!" (682). Stephen would rather die than have his mind subjected to a religion he does not believe in. Stephen even quotes Satan: "Non serviam!" which means he refuses to serve (Joyce 1146). Even though Stephen fails to make amends with the ghost of his late

mother, he does stand up for his principle and, after smashing the chandelier in Bella Cohen's brothel, he is no longer bothered by the idea of having failed his mother. Not only does Stephen's struggle with his mother show his subordination under a principle, it also shows how dominant the Catholic church was in Ireland.

In the 'Nestor' episode an important concept closely tied to domination gets introduced: the parasite. The concept of the parasite is introduced by Stephen which, according Jules David Law, brings a "traditional element into the schematic distinction between interiority and exteriority, home and away from home, familiar words and strange words, speaking and writing" (199). A parasite can be seen as a foreign invader, exploiting its host. The concept, however, is introduced in a different manner by Stephen when he describes Cyril Sargent, a student that has trouble keeping up with the rest:

> Ugly and futile: lean neck and tangled hair and a stain of ink, a snail's bed. Yet someone had loved him, borne him in her arms and in her heart. But for her the race of the world would have trampled him under foot, a squashed boneless snail. She had loved his weak watery blood drained from her own. Was that then real? The only true thing in life? (33)

Even though Stephen's description shows a parasite leeching of its host, in this case it is not centred around domination but on love; the host, in this case Sargent's mother, is willing to give her life for her child in order for it to survive. Stephen's description of Cyril Sargent depicts something Stephen lacks, which is unconditional love from a parental figure. Stephen claims to be like Sargent. Stephen, however, lacks the host that gives him unconditional love:

> Like him was I, these sloping shoulders, this gracelessness. My childhood bends beside me. Too far for me to lay a hand there once or lightly. Mine is far and his secret as our eyes. Secrets, silent, stony sit in the dark palaces of both our hearts: secrets weary of their tyranny: tyrants willing to be dethroned.

Stephen recognises himself in Sargent but without having unconditional love. It seems Stephen was never able to live according to his own principle in his childhood because the condition was that he had to be something he did not want to be, for instance, a Catholic.

Stephen not being a Catholic may have been one of his secrets that came out by not praying for his mother. This makes Stephen not only physically, but also mentally homeless.

Mr Deasy also deals with the concept of parasites. He is concerned about three types of parasites, according to Law: foot-and-mouth disease, rhetoric, and the Jews (199). Mr Deasy is similar to the Citizen in the sense that he has a one-track mind: "There can be no two opinions on the matter" (40). Furthermore, Mr Deasy is obsessed with the distinction between inside and outside, as Law claims he is most obsessed with a "home region that must be kept free of domination, invasion, or even siege" (199). This becomes clear as Mr Deasy discusses his letter for the paper concerning foot-and-mouth disease with Stephen. Mr Deasy's thoughts turn towards the Jew as a parasite:

> England is in the hand of the jews. In all the highest places: her finance, her press. And they are the signs of a nation's vital strength. I have seen it coming these years. As sure as we are standing here the jew merchants are already at their work of destruction. Old England is dying. (41)

Ironically, Mr Deasy fails to see that what the "parasitic" Jews are doing to England is comparable to what the English doing to Ireland. This, once more, shows Mr Deasy is subjected to what Simmel described as prestige leadership. Mr Deasy fails to see any wrongdoing by the English while similar acts by other people are condemned by him.

The 'Nestor' episode also creates an early connection between Stephen and Bloom. In Stephen's conversation with Mr Deasy the topics of Jews in England comes up. Mr Deasy's comments about the Jews in England not only show his anti-Semitism, it also shows Stephen's objective mind which is similar to Bloom's. Stephen comments on the fact that a merchant "buys cheap and sells dear," Jewish or not (41). Mr Deasy's thoughts, however, stay one-tracked:

> They sinned against the light, Mr Deasy said gravely. And you can see darkness in their eyes. And that is why they are wanderers on the earth to this day. (41)

Not only do Mr Deasy's comments on the Jews show Joyce's criticism on the anti-Semitic views in Ireland of the time, it also strengthens the connection between Bloom and Stephen. Mr Deasy's comment on the Jews having "sinned against the light" can be seen as foreshadowing Stephen's sinning against the light. Stephen's citing of Satan, his inability to pray for his mother, and his actual smashing of the chandelier in Bella Cohen's brothel, can be seen as a sinning against the light. Therefore, Stephen can, just like Bloom, be seen as a wanderer or, as Simmel puts it, a stranger. Furthermore, Bloom and Stephen can be seen as two people subordinated by a principle. The two might be able to create a better principle by, as Simmel described it, filling in the gaps where the principle falls short. Furthermore, they might be able to fill an emotional gap for each other as well. Bloom is looking for someone to fill the gap the loss of his son Rudy left, while Stephen is looking for parental love and guidance becomes he was never truly accepted by his own family. The unification of Bloom and Stephen, however, never happens. Even though the two meet, they never realise each other's full potential and stay at a distance. This becomes clear in the opening of the 'Ithaca' episode as they are described as walking in parallel lines, which never meet: "What parallel courses did Bloom and Stephen follow returning?" (776).

In *Ulysses* Stephen claims to be dominated by a plurality. He says he has three masters: the British state, Catholic church, and his friend Mulligan. The British state is personified by Mulligan's friend Haines. Haines usurps Stephen's home and tries to exploit him not only by taking his money, but also by making a collection of his sayings. Even though on the surface Stephen seems to be ruled by a plurality, he is ruled by a principle. This becomes clear when Stephen claims to be able to break the nooses of his rulers with ease. Stephen does not seem to care that his home and possessions are being claimed by Haines, as long as he stays true to his principle which means that his mind stays clear of corruption by the British or the Catholic Church. Furthermore, Stephen's inability to pray for his dying

mother shows even more that he is ruled by a principle. Even though the inability to pray for his mother haunts him, he eventually sticks up for his principle despite the fact that this means he does not reconcile with the ghost of his mother. Stephen's mother haunting him can be seen as the hold of the Catholic church on the Irish. It suggests the Catholic church manipulates the Irish into Catholicism. Parts of Stephen's principle are seen in his interaction with his mother's ghost when he claims he will not serve. His thoughts on freedom are also seen in his confrontation with a dog on Sandymount Beach where he respects the freedom of the dog and claims the dog will never be dominated or dominate another being. Stephen's principle seems to rely on the idea of free thought and not being controlled by religious ideas or rules that are not his own. Furthermore, the dog being able to roam around freely but getting kicked when its master considers it doing something wrong, shows the false idea of freedom domination gives.

The 'Nestor' episode brings forward how Stephen is in search of a parental figure who accepts him for who he is. His description of Cyril Sargent introduces the concept of the parasite but from the viewpoint of a loving host, Sargent's mother. Stephen feels similar to Sargent, except for the fact that Stephen misses the loving host that shows him unconditional love. Furthermore, Stephen's conversation with Mr Deasy shows Simmel's idea of domination by prestige. Mr Deasy is impressed by the British and considers their rule of the Irish almost an honour. Simmel claims domination by prestige creates unconditional followers which is seen in Mr Deasy. Mr Deasy describes the Jews as parasites invading and destroying old England, yet refuses to recognise the fact that the British are doing the same in Ireland. Furthermore, Stephen's confrontation with Mr Deasy reveals Stephen's objective view that is similar to the objective view of Simmel's stranger. Stephen becomes connected to Bloom in the sense that Stephen has sinned against the light. According to Mr Deasy, the Jews also sinned against the light, which connects Stephen to Bloom. Stephen sinned against the light

by not being a Catholic and he literally sinned against the light in Bella Cohen's brothel as he smashed the chandelier. Stephen is physically and spiritually homeless, similar to Bloom. While the two might be able to fill each other's gaps like Simmel described in his idea of subordination under a principle, they never seem to figure this out for themselves. Where Bloom is looking to give parental love and guidance to fill the gap of his lost son Rudy, Stephen is looking for parental love because he was never truly accepted in his own family. Unfortunately, as Joyce described, they moved in parallel courses, never actually touching each other.

3. Dublin, the Metropolis

Where the previous chapters dealt with Simmel's concept of the stranger in connection to Bloom's foreign background, and Simmel's ideas on domination linked to Stephen Dedalus being dominated by Haines and Mulligan, this chapter will focus on Simmel's views of mental life in a metropolis. In *Ulysses,* Joyce depicts Dublin as a metropolis, yet, as Vincent J. Cheng states, Ireland was in ruins at the end of the nineteenth century, as it was "devastated by centuries of famine, poverty, and rule by English landlords," and could be considered "a Third World country under British domination" (Cheng 2). In order to apply Simmel's views of mental life in a metropolis and to see whether Joyce was right to consider Dublin a metropolis, I will first provide a summary of Simmel's 1902 essay called "The Metropolis and Mental Life."

The function of the metropolis, according to Simmel, is to provide the ground for the struggle and reconciliation between "man's qualitative uniqueness and irreplaceability" (*The Sociology of* 423). In order to arrive at this point of uniqueness, however, the individual has to go through a relentless struggle in order to complete the development of becoming an individual that stands out (*The Sociology of* 409). The creation of the metropolis, according to Simmel, is the culmination of two developments taking place during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries:

> The eighteenth century called upon man to free himself of all the historical bonds in the state and in religion, in morals and in economics. Man's nature, originally good and common to all, should develop unhampered. The nineteenth century demanded the functional specialization of man and his work; this specialization makes one individual in comparable to another, and each of them indispensable to the highest possible extent. (*The Sociology of* 409).

The individual in the metropolis, therefore, is not tied to any bonds that might hold him back in his specialization. However, a fully developed metropolis is full of competition that makes

it harder for the individual to stand out. Simmel describes the development of a metropolis and its individuals in a series of stages.

First, the individual has to be able to cope with the increased amount of impulses one receives in a metropolis (*The Sociology of* 410). The metropolitan person must create an "organ," Simmel writes, in order to protect himself from the overflow of impulses: "He reacts with his head instead of his heart" (*The Sociology of* 410). This creates a rational, detached person who has a "matter-of-fact attitude" which is "indifferent to all genuine individuality" (*The Sociology of* 411). The metropolis is the "seat of the money economy," Simmel claims, and the individuals in a metropolis thrive better with a calculating mind in a world where everything boils down to how much something is worth in terms of money (*The Sociology of* 411). Simmel writes that this idea is in line with the ideal of natural science: "to transform the world into an arithmetic problem, to fix every part of the world by mathematical formulas" (*The Sociology of* 412). As the intellectual mind becomes all-important in a growing metropolis, calculability, punctuality, and exactness become the most important characteristics of an individual. This, however, leaves almost no room for "sovereign types of personality, characterized by irrational impulses" when every person is supposed to act according to the dominant lifestyle (*The Sociology of* 413). The dominant lifestyle is based on a quantitative measure, namely money, which becomes the "common denominator of all values" (*The Sociology of* 414).

As a metropolis grows, at one point it will attain the peak of this lifestyle of indifference. At this moment, the quantitative measure is no longer fulfilling and, in order to preserve oneself, the metropolitan individual has to devaluate the "whole objective world," which also renders himself into a feeling of worthlessness (*The Sociology of* 415). The problem with this, besides seeing oneself as worthless, is that, because of the indifferent lifestyle, the metropolitan individual is in no way able to express his feelings of

worthlessness, which results in a certain indifferent manner in social behaviour (*The Sociology of* 415). Simmel claims that this indifferent manner makes the metropolitan individual seem to be "cold and heartless" in the eyes of small-town people (*The Sociology of* 415). Furthermore, Simmel claims that because of this indifferent manner there is a conflict between the small-town people and metropolitans that "will break into hatred and fight at the moment of a closer contact, however caused" (*The Sociology of* 416). However, this cold manner is not the only cause for conflict. According to Simmel, there is also a mutual aversion present in the mind of the metropolitan individual and small-town people that lies at the root of this conflict.

In this aversion Simmel sees the strength of the metropolis. He claims that, even though one tries to be indifferent in a metropolis, every connection leaves behind a trail that shapes one's personality (*The Sociology of* 416). Simmel argues that, although it appears as a form of dissociation, the metropolitan style of life creates in reality "one of the elemental forms of socialization" (*The Sociology of* 416). He claims that through aversion "a relatively small circle firmly closed against neighboring, strange, or in some way antagonistic circles" is formed (*The Sociology of* 416). At first, the people in this circle can only develop their unique qualities and freedom in limited directions due to the small size of the group (*The Sociology of* 416). The group has strict rules to ensure its unity but also keeps the group from growing more quickly. As the group grows in size and number, however, rules become less strict, the unity loosens, and the individual gains more freedom of movement (*The Sociology of* 417). Furthermore, as the individual gains the opportunity to develop individually, he also attains a "specific individuality" with "occasion and necessity," due to the division of labour in the now larger group (*The Sociology of* 417). The larger the group grows, however, the harder it becomes to distinguish oneself because people will have the same specialization. Weaker individuals become suppressed while stronger individuals have to demonstrate themselves in

the most expressive way in order to stand out (*The Sociology of* 418). The metropolitan individual can feel nowhere as lonely as with the metropolitan crowd, due to the inability to express oneself or having to exaggerate in order to be heard (*The Sociology of* 418). Simmel, however, claims that the metropolitan man can be considered to enjoy more freedom as compared to the small-town man in the feudal age:

> The "free" man was the one who stood under the law of the land, that is, under the law of the largest social orbit, and the unfree man was the one who derived his right merely from the narrow circle of a feudal association and was excluded from the larger social orbit—so today metropolitan man is "free" in a spiritualized and refined sense, in contrast to the pettiness and prejudices which hem in the small-town man. (*The Sociology of* 418)

Simmel writes that, even though the metropolitan life can be seen as a struggle, in the end it is worth it because it will create a larger sense of freedom which results in a person being able to find and realize one's own way of life:

> The essential point is that the particularity and incomparability, which ultimately every human being possesses, be somehow expressed in the working-out of a way of life. That we follow the laws of our own nature—and this after all is freedom—becomes obvious and convincing to ourselves and to others only if the expressions of this nature differ from the expressions of others. (*The Sociology of* 420)

For Simmel this is only possible in the competitive environment of a metropolis where the strongest personalities become visible. Furthermore, Simmel points out that, ironically, people who preached the most extreme individualism, like Nietzsche, who are against the metropolis, are loved and seen as the saviours and prophets of the metropolitan man.

If we apply Simmel's theory of the metropolis to *Ulysses,* the first episode that comes to mind, if we regard Dublin as a metropolis, is the 'Wandering Rocks' episode. In this episode, Joyce describes Dublin as an active and diversified city, a sign that it is a modern metropolis. The episode encompasses stories of people in Dublin encountered by Father Conmee and the English Viceroy, who are moving separately through Dublin. Father Conmee

as a representative of the Catholic Church and the English Viceroy move through Dublin without intersecting as if they are dividing Dublin between the Catholic Church and the British state. At the end of the episode, the arranger–Joyce's narrator–zooms out, giving a "God's eye point of view" from Dublin (Joyce 1031). Kiberd notes that the view from above should remind readers that there are thousands of other people in Dublin, living their own lives and having their own monologues, and that "any might have been centralized in this book" (Joyce 1031). Frank Budgen states that, after Bloom or Stephen, now the city itself becomes the main character in the 'Wandering Rocks' episode (123). According to Julie McCormick Weng, the 'Wandering Rocks' episode is Joyce's way of showcasing Dublin by means of Dublin's railways, as the railway system is used and portrayed multiple times in the chapter and cuts through the heart of Dublin (29). Weng writes that Joyce's way of depicting the railway system in Dublin "as sophisticated and advanced generates a picture of the city as a modern metropole" (29). Bloom signifies the importance of the railway system when he mentions Larry O'Rourke's in the 'Calypso' episode:

> Good house, however: just the end of the city traffic. For instance M'Auley's down there: n.g. as position. Of course if they ran a tramline along the North Circular from the cattle market to the quays value would go up like a shot. (69)

Not only does this signify the importance of the Dublin railway system, it also shows the importance of money, which Simmel noted as an important part of the development of the metropolis.

The 'Wandering Rocks' episode demonstrates by means of the arranger the indifferent attitude of people in the metropolis Simmel wrote about. The episode contains nineteen vignettes of different lives in Dublin happening at the same. The trouble, however, with these stories is that they are never finished. The arranger moves away from the people and their stories before getting too much involved. Furthermore, the vignettes mostly describe exteriors, leaving the portraits, according to Kiberd, "clinical and cold" (Joyce 1033). The

arranger clearly shows the indifferent "matter-of-fact" attitude Simmel described, that one needs to survive the metropolitan life by not investing too much into the people on the street due to the vast amount of impulses (*The Sociology of* 411). When the arranger describes Eccles street, for example, there is "a generous white arm" mentioned twice, throwing a coin from a window (288). The arm belongs to Bloom's wife Molly. The arranger, however, does not take the time to describe that the "plump bare generous arm" belongs to Molly (289). Furthermore, even though the vignettes never go into very much detail, some characters do get an extensive description:

> Mr Denis J. Maginni, professor of dancing, &c., in silk hat, slate frockcoat with silk facings, white kerchief tie, tight lavender trousers, canary gloves and pointed patent boots, walking with grave deportment most respectfully took the curbstone as he passed lady Maxwell at the corner of Dignam's court. (282)

The extravagant Mr Denis J. Maginni gets fully described as he stands out of the crowd, whereas Mrs M'Guinness merely gets described as "silverhaired" (282). These differences in description show that, as Simmel noted, the stronger individuals are demonstrating their individuality in order to stand out of the crowd in a metropolis.

Another important point in the 'Wandering Rocks' episode that aligns with Simmel's theory, is the fact that neither Bloom or Stephen Dedalus show loyalty to the political and religious powers prominent in the episode. Simmel argued that religious or political bonds have no place in a metropolis as they are things that have lost their importance in the eighteenth century due to individualisation. Even though the Catholic church and the English have control over Ireland, the two most prominent "modern" metropolitan men, Bloom and Stephen, do not see the English viceroy and ignore Father Conmee. Both characters are busy looking for books. Bloom is looking for a book to bring his wife and only acknowledges people looking at the extravagant Maginni: "On O'Connell bridge many persons observed the

grave deportment and gay apparel of Mr Denis J. Maginni, professor of dancing &c" (302). As Stephen is browsing a bookseller's cart he gets passed by Father Conmee:

> I might find here one of my pawned schoolprizes.
> *Stephano Dedalo, alumno optimo, palmam ferenti.*
> Father Conmee, having read his little hours, walked through the hamlet of Donnycarney, murmuring vespers.
> Binding too good probably, what is this? Eighth and ninth book of Moses. Secret of all secrets. Seal of King David. (311-12)

Both Stephen and Bloom seem to ignore Father Conmee and do not get to see the Viceroy's cavalcade. This shows the lack of influence the two reigning powers of Ireland have on Stephen and Bloom. Furthermore, while Stephen and Bloom miss the Viceroy's cavalcade in the 'Wandering Rocks' episode, most of the citizens of Dublin that do get to see it, ignore the viceroy's cavalcade or do not know who is passing them:

> Between Queen's and Whitworth bridges Lord Dudley's viceregal carriage passed and were unsaluted by Mr Dudley White, B.L., M.A. … an elderly female about to enter changed her plan and retracing her steps by King's windows smiled credulously on the representative of His Majesty. … From Cahill's corner the reverend Hugh C. Love, M. A., made obeisance unperceived… Beyond Lundy Foot's from the shaded door of Kavanagh's winerooms John Wyse Nolan smiled with unseen coldness towards the lord lieutenantgeneral… and Haines gravely, gazed down on the viceregal equipage (324-26)

Not only does this show the animosity of the Irish towards the English colonizer, it also shows the lack of importance attached to political bonds Simmel spoke of. The Dubliners do not care who is in charge as long as they can continue to live their lives.

The 'Wandering Rocks' episode also shows, in accordance with Simmel, Dublin to be a metropolitan place that revolves around money. At the very start of the episode, Father Conmee refuses to give some coins to a one-legged sailor begging for money. Instead, the reverend "blessed him in the sun for his purse held, he knew, one silver crown" (280). The silver crown, which is worth five shillings, is an amount that reverberates throughout the episode and, therefore, throughout Dublin. At Dillon's auction house, curtains are being

auctioned for five shilling (304), Dilly Dedalus assumes her father has got the same amount as a loan (305), and it is the amount Bloom paid to the Dignam fund (317). Furthermore, the sailor whom Father Conmee refused to give money to, does receive a coin from Bloom's wife, Molly (288-89). The reverend also seems to be caught up in metropolitan life as he seems to care more about money than his religion. He refuses to help the poor, wears a silk hat, and cleaned his teeth with areca nut paste, a toothpaste primarily used by the upper class (281). Besides that, his comment on the use of turf shows he is not one of the poor people:

> It was idyllic: and Father Conmee reflected on the providence of the Creator who had made turf to be in bogs where men might dig it out and bring it to town and hamlet to make fires in the houses of poor people. (284)

Mr Deasy also confirms the importance of money as he pays out Stephen in the 'Nestor' episode. "You don't know yet what money is. Money is power, when you have lived as long as I have," Mr Deasy claims (36-37). As discussed in chapter two of this thesis, Mr Deasy has fully embraced the English colonisers and considers himself one of them. Mr Deasy claims to be debt-free, something Stephen confesses he is not. This makes Mr Deasy feel superior: "Mr Deasy laughed with rich delight, putting back his savingbox. –I knew you couldn't, he said joyously" (37-38). This shows that, for Mr Deasy, money represents status. Stephen, however, does acknowledge the importance of money, but also claim it to be corrupted: "Symbols too of beauty and power. A lump in my pocket. Symbols soiled by greed and misery" (36). This shows that Stephen's way of thinking is more suited for a fully developed metropolis whereas Mr Deasy is still concerned with identifying himself through means of money. As Simmel described, individuals in a metropolis will first identify with value, that is money, until it reaches its peak, followed by a sense of worthlessness, aversion, and, eventually, a competition of personalities. Stephen's realisation after listing his debts, claiming "the lump I have is useless," can therefore be seen not only as him being in debt, but also as acknowledging the exaggerated importance of money.

The headlines in the 'Aeolus' episode seem to display the process of a growing metropolis in Simmel's theory. Where the headlines start off "factual and restrained," as Kiberd notes, they slowly grow "more offhand and slangy, in the popular, modern fashion" (Joyce 991). The headlines start with the matter-of-fact attitude Simmel wrote about, with headlines like: "THE WEARER OF THE CROWN" (147) and "WILLIAM BRAYDEN, ESQUIRE, OF OAKLANDS, SANDYMOUNT" (148). As the 'Aelous' episode progresses, the headlines become more absurd and nonsensical: "DIMINISHED DIGITS PROVE TOO TITILLATING FOR FRISKY FRUMPS, ANNE WIMBLES, FLO WANGLES–YET CAN YOU BLAME THEM? (189). The development of the headlines seems to mimic the growing difficulty Simmel observed about having to stand out in a metropolis. At the start of a growing metropolis everything has to be impersonal and detached. However, as the metropolis starts to flourish and money loses its function to distinguish a person from another, the focus becomes more aimed at creating a unique personality instead of conspicuous consumption. The trouble, however, is that it becomes increasingly harder to stand out, according to Simmel, as everyone tries to show they are special.

The 'Circe' episode shows how an increased amount of stimuli has an effect on the metropolitan individual, in this case Bloom. As Bloom walks along the streets in Nighttown in the 'Circe' episode, he is within 50 yards exposed to a plethora of impulses as he walks along Talbot street:

> he crosses the road to avoid a lurching drunk, he is narrowly missed by two cyclists, he is nearly run over by a street-car, he has two kids bump into him (causing him to check his pockets, as he suspects it is a pickpocket's ruse), he skirts a rowdy gang outside a pub, he is hailed by three prostitutes and an old bawd pimping a teenager, and he bumps into (or imagines what he would say if he were to bump into) a respectable acquaintance and has to account for his being in the red-light district to her. (Keohane 32)

Apart from showing the vast amount of impulses one has to take in and has to be indifferent to, the 'Circe' episode also sheds a different light on Bloom's confrontation with Bella Cohen with regard to Simmel's theory of mental life in the metropolis. Not only does Bloom's conflict with Bella Cohen can be seen as him regaining his self-confidence, it also shows the relentless struggle of the individual in the metropolis, which is needed to stand out of the crowd. The two personalities clash and the absurdity of Bloom's fantasy shows the extremes one must go to in order to maintain a unique and individual voice in a metropolis.

Bloom's clash with the Citizen is explained by Simmel in the description of an ancient polis:

> The ancient *polis* seems in this regard to have had a character of a small town. The incessant threat against its existence by enemies from near and far brought about that stern cohesion in political and military matters, that supervision of the citizen by other citizens, and that jealousy of the whole toward the individual whose own private life was repressed to such an extent that he could compensate himself only by acting as a despot in his own household. The tremendous agitation and excitement, and the unique colorfulness of Athenian life is perhaps explained by the fact that constant struggle against the incessant inner and external oppression of a de-individualizing small town. This created an atmosphere of tension in which the weaker were held down and the stronger were impelled to the most passionate type of self-protection (*On Individuality* 333)

The Citizen's behaviour represents an extreme version of the jealousy of the whole towards the individual. Bloom, therefore, cannot be seen solely as Simmel's stranger, but also as a modern metropolitan man clashing with small-town people. The Citizen acts like a tyrant in the pub who does not allow any other viewpoints that clash with his. The Citizen's ultimate attempt of violence towards Bloom can be seen as a passionate representation of self-protection. Furthermore, the clash shows the mutual aversion between metropolitan individuals and small-town people Simmel wrote about.

Bloom and Stephen can be seen as unique characters who have to struggle to keep their unique personalities. According to Simmel, this struggle only becomes more difficult as

a city grows larger. Kiberd notes that *Ulysses* is an "epic of a city;" Dublin can be seen as a character on its own (Joyce 1032). The question arises, however, if Dublin can actually be seen as the metropolis Simmel described. The city seems to have more in common with a small town.

Firstly, this is shown by how Bloom is treated by his fellow Dubliners. The Citizen's narrow-minded, nationalistic behaviour and Bloom's companions' constant ridiculing of him might be the beginning of a small circle, a unit which in Simmel's view could grow into a diverse metropolitan core. However, the Citizen's behaviour could also simply be the behaviour of small-town folk. Secondly, even though Joyce's Dublin seems to revolve around money, most of the city seems to live in poverty and on loans, not a blooming rich metropolis where money will soon lose the status of common denominator. Therefore, the city can hardly be considered to be the "seat of money economy," Simmel wrote about. Furthermore, even though the bonds of politics seem to be unimportant, the fact that Ireland is still "dominated" by the British colonizers is a big topic in the novel. Besides that, religion is still a major factor in Dublin as the Catholic Church can be seen as a second superordinater besides the British.

Lastly, the amount of impulses in a metropolis can be overwhelming which can be seen in Bloom's walk through Nighttown in the 'Circe' episode. Simmel writes that, in order to manage these impulses mentally, the metropolitan individual needs to become indifferent. In the 'Lotus-Eaters' episode Bloom leaves his house for a walk to calm his mind. Kiberd suggests that the streets of Dublin can be seen as "therapeutic centres in which certain repressed souls walk their frustrations off" (Joyce 974). According to Simmel, the streets of a metropolis would not be seen as a "therapeutic centre" because of the excessive amount of impulses one would have. Furthermore, Bloom seems to know every person he meets personally on his "therapeutic" walk. According to Simmel, this should be overwhelming in a metropolis. Perhaps in size and development, the Dublin portrayed in *Ulysses* can be seen as a

metropolis. As far as Simmel's theory goes, Joyce's Dublin should be considered a small town or a metropolis that just started to develop. Stephen and Bloom's difficulties to fit in arise from the problem that they have a metropolitan mindset in a city that still has a small-town mindset.

Even though Dublin should be seen more as a small-town than a metropolis according to Simmel's theory, it did form both Bloom and Stephen's minds into having a metropolitan attitude. They are both born and raised Dubliners and, therefore, a product of Dublin. Keohane states that the novel shows how the characters were formed by the city:

> This was the context of friction, of random encounter, of vibrant social antagonism, on the streets, in the markets, in the brothels and especially in the pubs, in which the sensibility and the idiom of the modern Irish urban character were forged, and it is the forging of this character that Joyce reveals for us in the young Stephen and the mature Bloom (both aspects of himself and Everyman) in the epic of modern Ulysses. (Keohane 33)

Stephen and Bloom together represent modern life in the metropolis as they can be characterized as to have, what Simmel calls, the "objective spirit over the subjective spirit" (*The Sociology of* 421). According to Simmel, the metropolitan is able to view the world, though imperfectly, from more than his subjective view:

> In language as well as in law, in the technique of production as well as in art, in science as well as in the objects of the domestic environment, there is embodied a sum of spirit. The individual in his intellectual development follows the growth of this spirit very imperfectly and at an ever increasing distance. (*The Sociology of* 421)

Bloom can be considered as following science, the technique of production, and objects of the domestic environment with his visions of reforming Ireland, and inventions like the railway hearse. Stephen, on the other hand, can be seen as following art and law with his poetry and extensive book-knowledge.

Simmel claims religion and state power would be of no importance in a metropolis, something which can be seen in the behaviour of Stephen and Bloom. Firstly, they both seem

to care little about religion. Bloom, in whom three main religions reside because he and his father chose to convert for their wives, shows he cares more about their wife than his religion. For Bloom, coming home to his wife is entering "the land of promise" (867). Molly, therefore, is for Bloom his heaven. Furthermore, Stephen, even though he was raised as a Catholic, does not seem to believe, which becomes clear in his discussion with Haines in the 'Telemachus' episode:

> –You're not a believer, are you? Haines asked. I mean, a believer in the narrow sense of the word. Creation from nothing and miracles and a personal God.
> –There's only one sense of the word, it seems to me, Stephen said.
> …
> –Yes, of course, he said, as they went on again. Either you believe or you don't, isn't it? Personally I couldn't stomach that idea of a personal God. You don't stand for that, I suppose?
> –You behold in me, Stephen said with grim displeasure, a horrible example of free thought. (23)

Stephen, even if he says it with "grim displeasure," admits that he does not believe in God. Stephen's free thought means "thought free from the dictates of 'Christian revelation,'" according to Gifford and Seidman (qtd in Lernout 109). Furthermore, Stephen's relation to his mother (discussed in chapter two of this thesis) reveals that Stephen is subordinated by a principle that does not allow him to believe in Christianity. Both Stephen and Bloom have moved on from the conventional sense of religion which is, however, still very much present in Dublin at the time.

By giving Bloom and Stephen modern personalities in an archaic Dublin, Joyce might be showing the potential Ireland has. If Ireland is able to shake off its archaic mode of thinking and accept the ideas of the "eccentric" stranger Bloom, Dublin could be well on its way to becoming a true blooming metropolis, if the Dubliners do not crucify Bloom before accepting him.

In the eyes of Joyce, Dublin is a metropolis, yet, according to Simmel, not one that is developed far enough to accept characters like Bloom. Simmel describes the development of a

metropole as first developing as a seat of money economy. The metropolitan individual is calculating, indifferent, and objective. As the metropolis grows, money becomes less of a common denominator and the opportunity for the development of specialisations and personality becomes important. At this point individuality reaches its peak as it becomes of the utmost importance to stand out of the crowd to maintain your individuality. When Simmel's theory on mental life in a metropolis is applied to *Ulysses,* it shows several similarities to Joyce's Dublin being a metropolis. Joyce's Dublin seems thriving, full of impulses, and personalities. Especially the 'Wandering Rocks' episode depicts Dublin as a metropolis that is in line with Simmel's theories. Furthermore, Bloom and Stephen seem to be adapting to life in a metropolis. Bloom, for instance, learns to fight for his individuality in his confrontations with Bella Cohen and the nationalistic Citizen. These confrontations show the relentless struggle of an individual in a metropolis. Stephen also shows his individualistic side in his attitude towards religion and money. Stephen is ruled by a principle which is seen when he stands up to the ghost of his mother and his attitude towards money in his conversation with Mr Deasy. Stephen belief that money is corrupted and the amount one has should not be used as a judgment of character goes against the common idea that money equals status.

Even though there are some similarities between Joyce's Dublin and Simmel's description of the metropolis, Joyce's Dublin cannot be regarded as a fully developed metropolis. The city can be seen in many ways as the seat of money economy, as everyone is concerned with earning money. However, Dublin is not the thriving metropolis Simmel describes, but can be considered more as a poor town. In order to develop as a metropolis, money must lose its value as a common denominator because it is available to everyone and becomes a commonality. Furthermore, Simmel's theory on mental life in the metropolis shows that Bloom not only clashes with the Dubliners due to his foreign background, but also because he seems to have a metropolitan mindset whereas the Dubliners, like the Citizen,

have a small-town mindset. With regard to Simmel's theory, the Dubliners and Bloom are bound to clash due to a mutual aversion. Bloom's modern ideas depict an open metropolis where everyone is able to express themselves, not get attacked for it. The manner in which Bloom is treated, however, shows that the Dubliners have a small-town attitude. Even though one stage of the metropolitan is having a small circle that grows bigger and gains more room for individuality, the fact that Dublin is still controlled by the British and the Catholic church, has mostly poor people, and only appears to have the amount of impulses a metropolis should have, makes it impossible to view it as a full metropolitan society. The reason that Bloom does not feel at home, therefore, is not only because he gets treated like a stranger, but also that his ideas and personality are more in line with a metropolitan type like Stephen, than the narrow small-town attitude the Dubliners have.

Conclusion

By analysing the concept of home in *Ulysses* with Georg Simmel's sociology as a referential framework, I have argued that Joyce questions the concept of home in terms of nationality, religion, domination, and mental life in a metropolis. Joyce shows that the Irish are struggling with their national identity due to being dominated by the British state and the Catholic Church. The Dubliners in *Ulysses* seem to be defined by their nationality and religion. Anyone divergent from having Irish roots or being a Catholic will not be accepted and made feel welcome, making it impossible for "outsiders" to feel at home. Home, therefore, is closely tied to having Irish heritage and being Catholic for the Dubliners in *Ulysses*. Even though the Dubliners seem to identify themselves as Irish Catholics, they seem to have lost some true Irish characteristics, as well as the main message of Christianity. The Gaelic language, for instance, is not understood by the Irish milk-woman, and the Dubliners rather put force against force than be willing to adopt the Christian message to "love your neighbour." Simmel's work in sociology helps in identifying the reasons why the Dubliners judge people on their religious and national heritage, instead of an individual's personality.

In *Ulysses,* Joyce shows an alternative to the Dubliners' idea of home in the characters Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom, especially the latter as he never gets accepted in the Dublin society, finds an alternative for home in his wife Molly. Bloom is a second generation Hungarian Jew in Ireland and fits in with Simmel's concept of the stranger. Simmel's stranger can be compared to a wanderer that sticks to one place. He is allowed to join a group but never becomes accepted because he does not initially belong there. Because the stranger does not initially belong in the group, he can have an objective view because his mind works according to his own rules and conditions, not those of the group. Furthermore, the stranger, even though likely to have things in common with the native group, gets treated as an outsider and is judged on the basis of his background, not his personality. Bloom fits the description of

Simmel's stranger perfectly. Even though he is allowed to join a group of Dubliners, Bloom constantly gets shunned by his fellow Dubliners. Even more, he is treated as a foreign invader and seen as the stereotypical 'money-hungry' Jew. He shows the objective view of the stranger in his clash with the Citizen by confronting the anti-Semitic Citizen with the fact that his saviour, Jesus Christ, was Jewish. Besides showing Bloom's objective view, the scene also shows Bloom to live more according to Christian notions than the Catholic Citizen. Bloom spreads a message of love in resolving conflicts while the Citizen wants to put force against force. Even though Bloom is eager to fit in with the Dubliners, he will never be able to, due to his background. Eventually, Bloom learns to accept that he is different and use this to his advantage. His eagerness to feel at home in a place where he will not be accepted for who he is gets replaced by a feeling of satisfaction in coming home to his wife.

Stephen Dedalus does not get the redemption of finding a place of belonging like Bloom does. Furthermore, where Bloom is seen as a foreign invader, Stephen's home gets invaded by the British, Haines. Stephen becomes both physically as well as mentally homeless and is in search for a sense of belonging just like Bloom. By applying Simmel's work on domination to Stephen, it becomes clear that Stephen is not a subordinate of a plurality, like the Irish being subordinated to both the English state and Catholic Church, but a subordinate of a principle.

Stephen claims to be the subordinate of three masters: the British state, the Catholic Church, and his friend Mulligan. Mulligan's British friend, Haines, represents the British state as he both exploits Stephen and usurps his house. However, Stephen claims to be able to easily overthrow his rulers if needed. This ties in with Simmel's theory of domination in the fact that, according to Simmel, man both wants to be dominated as well as oppose his leader in order to be relieved from responsibility and keep his sense of autonomy.

While Haines is an example of the British rule of the Irish, Stephen feels the pressure of the other Irish superordinate, the Catholic Church, in his relation to his mother. Stephen is literally haunted by his inability to fulfil his mother's dying wish of Stephen praying for her. Stephen's principle, however, is one of free thought. Stephen refuses to let his mind be corrupted by something like religion and, therefore, is unable to pray for his mother. According to Simmel, an individual subordinated under a principle is completely determined by it, which is shown in Stephen and his inability to disregard his principle. Stephen, similar to Bloom, learns to stick up for his beliefs, even though they make him an outcast amongst the Dubliners. Stephen shows to be similar in behaviour to Bloom and, in a sense, can also be seen as an example of Simmel's stranger. Furthermore, Stephen's struggle with his mother's ghost and his description of a student reveal Stephen is longing for a parental figure that will give him unconditional love. Even though Bloom is looking for a son to figure as a parental figure, the two never connect in that way. This leaves Stephen's search for belonging unfulfilled.

Joyce's Dublin in *Ulysses* becomes a third major character in the novel besides Stephen and Bloom. While Joyce depicts the city of Dublin as a metropolis, the behaviour of its inhabitants prove otherwise. When applying Simmel's theory of mental life in the metropolis to Joyce's novel, it becomes clear that the city can be seen as either a metropolis in the very early stages of development or a small town. According to Simmel, the several stages of the development of the metropolis culminate into a centre where the most unique personalities are able to develop. Individuals in the metropolis get judged on their personalities and specialisation, and not, like what happens to Stephen and Bloom, on their religious or ancestral heritage. Furthermore, Simmel's metropolis goes through a development where money loses its value as a common denominator because it is available to everyone. This is hardly the case for Joyce's Dublin as most of its inhabitants live in poverty. The many

impulses of the metropolis make its inhabitants adapt to an indifferent attitude towards others. Even though the arranger shows this type of behaviour in the ‘Wandering Rocks’ episode and Bloom briefly in the ‘Circe’ episode, Bloom’s friendly attitude on the streets of Dublin shows he is personally invested in most of the people he meets, something that would not be possible in a metropolis, according to Simmel. Characters like Mr Deasy and the Citizen show behaviour that is more in line with that of a small town than a metropolis.

Joyce seems to show the potential that Dublin has of becoming a modern metropolis in the characters of Stephen and Bloom, and shows his critique on the narrow-minded Dubliners. Even though Stephen fails to find his home in Dublin, Bloom reaches his home, or “promised land,” in Molly’s “plump mellow yellow smellow melons of her rump,” showing that, home is where you are accepted for who you are as a person, not your religious or foreign background (Joyce 867).

Works Cited

Baffoe, Michael. *Strangers in New Homelands: The Social Deconstruction and Reconstruction of 'Home' Among Immigrants in The Diaspora*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012. eBook Collection (EBSCOhost). Web. 13 Feb. 2017.

Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1960. Print.

Cheng, Vincent J. *Joyce, Race, and Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.

Isyar, Bora, and Agnes Czajka. *Europe After Derrida: Crisis and Potentiality*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 13 Dec. 2016.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* Annotated Student Edition. ed. Declan Kiberd. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2011. Print.

Keohane, Kieran. "The Revitalization of the City and the Demise of Joyce's Utopian Modern Subject." *Theory, Culture & Society Vol 19, Issue 3* (2002): 29-49. Web. 21 June 2017.

Law, Jules David. "Joyce's 'Delicate Siamese' Equation: The Dialectic of Home in *Ulysses*." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 102.2* (1987): 197-205. ProQuest. Web. 9 Dec. 2016.

Latham, Sean, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ulysses:* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Print.

Lawrence, Karen R. *Who's Afraid Of James Joyce?* Florida: University Press of Florida, 2010. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 11 Dec. 2016.

Lernout, Geert. “A Horrible Example of Free Thought: God in Stephen’s *Ulysses*.” *Papers on Joyce 10/11* (2004-2005): 105-142. Web. 15 June 2017.

Levitt, Morton P. “’The Greatest Jew of all’: James Joyce, Leopold Bloom, and the Modernist Archetype.” *Papers on Joyce 10/11* (2004-2005): 143–162. Web. 15 Jun. 2017.

Meyer, Joseph Matthew. “Redefining The Epic Hero in Joyce's ‘Eumaeus.’” *Midwest Quarterly* 50.2 (2009): 137-148. *Academic Search Alumni Edition*. Web. 11 Dec. 2016.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. 1978. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.

Simmel, Georg. *Georg Simmel on individuality and social forms: selected writings*. Ed. Donald N. Levine. Chicago etc: University of Chicago Press, 1971. Print.

---. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* Trans. Wolff, Kurt H. Toronto: Collier-MacMillan Canada, Ltd,1969. Print.

---. “The Metropolis and Mental Life.” *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* Trans. Kurt H. Wolff. Toronto: Collier-MacMillan Canada, Ltd, 1969. 409-424. Print.

Thoreau, Henry D. *The Illustrated Walden*. 1902. New York: Penguin Random House LLC, 2016. Print.

Weng, J. M. “From ‘Dear Dirty Dublin’ to ‘Hibernian Metropolis’: A Vision of the City through the Tramways of Ulysses.” *Joyce Studies Annual, vol. 2015 no. 1* (2015): 28-54. Web. 22 June 2017.

Woodruff, Adam. “Nobody at Home: Bloom's Outlandish Retreat in the ‘Cyclops’ Chapter of *Ulysses*.” *European Journal of English Studies 3.3* (1999): 275-84. ProQuest. Web. 9 Dec. 2016.