

1-1-2013

A Global Joyce: Early Sightings of Cosmopolitan Ethics in Ulysses

Matthew Zeller
University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zeller, M.(2013). *A Global Joyce: Early Sightings of Cosmopolitan Ethics in Ulysses*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/1113>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

A Global Joyce: Early Sightings of Cosmopolitan Ethics in *Ulysses*

by

Matt Zeller

Bachelor of Arts

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

English

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2013

Accepted by:

Thomas Jackson Rice, Director of Thesis

Susan Vanderborg, Second Reader

Lacy Ford, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Acknowledgements

I thank Dr. Thomas Jackson Rice for his direction, guidance, and encouragement throughout the course of the project. He was always reassuring and forgiving, qualities that are always undervalued in an advisor.

Also, I thank Dr. Susan Vanderborg for being a constant source of praise and reassurance since the beginning of my graduate career. Her pedagogical knowledge and compassion are unparalleled.

Lastly, I thank Mr. Richard Zeller and Mrs. Kimberly Zeller. Their struggles have led their son to achieve a graduate education which culminated in this project. Their support is the reason I am able to write this sentence today.

Abstract

"*Ulysses* is like a great net let down upon the life of a microcosmic city-state, Dublin, wherein lie captured all sorts and conditions of men and minds," wrote Stuart Gilbert, the famous literary scholar whose landmark 1930 book-length investigation into Joyce's magnum opus cemented his legacy as one of the first Joyceans. In saying so, Gilbert quietly proposes an early reading of Joyce's global ethics long before the study of humanities had developed the post-colonial focus necessary to more fully grasp the cosmopolitan ethics asserted in *Ulysses*. Gilbert was not alone. Because of his self-imposed exile and thematic insistence on Ireland as a nation, Joyce's work is a prime case study for any scholar interested in understanding the complicated interactions between the national and the global. Several critics saw this possibility in Joyce's texts and formulated opinions that now echo contemporary work on the notion of the cosmopolitan. Because these critics did not have the shoulders of cosmopolitan scholars to stand on, the first chapter of this essay demonstrates Joyce's complicated understanding of cosmopolitanism by close reading a significant scene from the Cyclops episode. The second chapter discusses how early Joycean critics demonstrated their knowledge of Joyce's globalized ethics in *Ulysses* in the colonial rather than the post-colonial era. Together, the chapters demonstrate that the divide between nationalism and cosmopolitanism lives in

language – the semiotic collision between ideologues whose signifiers are incapable of reaching the intended signified meaning for each audience. To Joyce, “[n]ationalism has seemed to him as dangerous to intellectual freedom as religion, and the two forces have parallel importance in his maturity” (Watson, "Portrait" 102). In *Ulysses*, Joyce proposes that nationalism oppresses through semiotics.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Joyce's Definition of Cosmopolitanism in <i>Ulysses's</i> Cyclops Episode.....	3
3. Joyce's Early Critics' Recognition of Cosmopolitanism.....	28
4. Conclusion.....	38
5. Works Cited.....	40

1. Introduction

In the Cyclops episode, Bloom talks nation-building with patrons in Barney Kiernan's pub. The conversation establishes collapsible binaries: the speakers oppose the psychological self and the sociological nation, and, as a corollary, Bloom equates "force, hatred, [and] history" and opposes it with "love," defined as "the opposite of hatred" (*U* 12.1485). In doing so, the text institutes a means to understanding self-definition in relation to nationality and race, two factors which serve to collapse the binary between self and nation, irrevocably comingling the psychological with the sociological. In other words, the individual constitutes the social realm while the social realm simultaneously constitutes the individual. Although Bloom hopes to resist the patrons' insistence on national history as a means to define him, he indirectly admits that he, a man with a complicated nationality and race, is subject to self-definition by social relations by stating that "love" – romanticized but indeed a social relation – is "that that is really life" (*U* 12.1483). While Bloom's self-definition escapes the one-eyed, single-minded self-definition of the citizen whose identity is inseparably steeped in dangerous nationalistic ideology, he does not separate himself from his nationality or race. The conversation continues in a manner that resembles Walter Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History." Just as Benjamin states that a "system of mirrors create[s] the illusion" of transparency for history

(Benjamin 253), the conversation's tone and repetition are the system of mirrors that create the illusion of a polite conversation between two men with opposite ideological positions. The citizen's sarcastic rebuttals to Bloom's admiration of love and the narrator's following paragraph create slippages between the signifiers and signified by means of tone, a subjective literary construct dependent on its listener, and repetition that alters the linguistic use of words in a way that makes the signified unreachable. The episode's linguistic slippage and extra-linguistic construction in tone dissolves the binary between the psychological self and the sociological nation to emphasize how self-definition is inextricably related to social relations – force, hatred, history, *and* love. In this way, Joyce illuminates the problems of nationalistic ethics, as represented by the citizen, and the benefits of cosmopolitan ethics, as represented by Leopold Bloom.

2. Joyce's Definition of Cosmopolitanism in *Ulysses's* Cyclops Episode

Benjamin's "system of mirrors" is present in the intentional linguistic obfuscation of the word "love." Barthes calls language "the treasure deposited by the practice of speech, in the subjects belonging to the same community," saying so because linguistics is often unable to discern meaning – that is, accurately connect signifier to signified – by structural elements of the sentence itself (Barthes 16). Joyce's "Love loves to love love" passage (*U* 12.1493-1501), considered a "mock[ery of] Bloom's expression of fraternal piety, has often been viewed as the most stinging attack on the sentimentality of benevolent toleration, which, previous to the intrusion, appears to be a viable response to the citizen's nationalist-based bigotry" (Davison 245). Davison's interpretation illustrates the necessity of context in order to discern what Derrida calls "force," or the "invisible interior of poetic freedom" ("Force" 8). The traditional reading of this passage as an undercutting of Bloom's sentimental declaration of "love" as "that that is really life" excludes the "invisible interior" of the passage – namely, a declaration of cosmopolitan ethos run rampant.

To linguistically outline the "Love loves to love love" passage is to, as Derrida puts it, become fascinated by form "when one no longer has the force to understand force from within itself" (3). The sentence revels in the ambiguity

inherent in words – that a single word could function as subject and predicate, as noun and verb. The “invisible interior” of the sentence is not the linguistically determined meaning parsed by declaring each word as a specific part of speech. Instead, Joyce adds ambiguity through repetition as a means to emphasize the “play” available in words, much as he does with his characters. Although the “man in the brown macintosh [who] loves a lady who is dead” could be associated with Mr. Duffy in “A Painful Case” from the *Dubliners* collection (Gifford 365), Joyce echoes the mysterious M'intosh and additionally keeps the description anonymous enough to reflect nearly any Dublin male on a given day. Similarly, the “nurse,” the “new chemist,” and even the seemingly specific “Constable 14 A” (*U* 12.1493) are titles but ultimately substitutable for any person who currently serves under those occupations. Although Gerty MacDowell is definitely identifiable as a character in Joyce’s novel, she appears in a text that has copious fictional correspondences to real Dubliners; to whom Gerty does or does not correspond in Joyce’s life is ultimately an unachievable piece of knowledge even if biographical scholars could build a case for a specific Dubliner. In any case, the object of her affection is a currently anonymous “boy that has the bicycle” (*U* 12.1494) whose identity will not be given until the next episode, once again obfuscating the direction of love. Even the named references such as “Old Mr Verschoyle with the ear trumpet” and “Mrs Verschoyle with the turnedin eye” (*U* 12.1496-7) are specified by their age and disability, a generalization of love between elderly persons, rather than relying on

the specificity of their names. Comparably, "Li Chi Han" and "Cha Pu Chow" are characterized by their foreignness, as the English in their sentence reflects Pidgin English ("lovey up kissy") (*U* 12.1495), and they become caricatures or stand-ins for Chinese persons. Joyce finishes the passage by entering the second-person: "You love a certain person" (*U* 12.1499). In doing so, the narrator speaks to any potential *Ulysses* reader even though the text refers to a specific "you."

The notion that any reader could be the "you" and the notion that any person could fit the caricatures Joyce has constructed in the previous sentences are the "invisible interior" of the passage, made invisible by pretend specificity. Although readers are tempted to definitively identify the individuals to whom Joyce refers in every passage of the book, this passage in particular establishes a mask of specificity which clouds the replaceable nature of the people mentioned. I do not mean to imply that definitive identity of the characters is impossible for readers to reach. Joyce's contemporaneous readers could have identified "Jumbo, the elephant" (*U* 12.1496) present in the same paragraph, as the famous elephant in the London zoo. Some signifieds are available via their signifiers; language and therefore *Ulysses* is not completely indeterminate. In this way, I turn back to Benjamin and Barthes: the system of mirrors that simultaneously obfuscates but seemingly clarifies our understanding of history is discernible only insofar as we understand social relations in the same way we understand semiotics: words, like characters in literature, are replaceable entities which signify a particular meaning but only in that they relate to one

another. As a result, this passage is not a mere "stinging attack" on "sentimentality" but a declaration of cosmopolitan ethics: because individuals are socially defined, that is, defined by our definitions of them, such as their age, race, disability, occupation, etc. It is the responsibility of a social unit to consider the welfare of other social units regardless of their definition. Joyce states this most poignantly in the last line in this paragraph: "And this person loves that other person because everybody loves somebody but God loves everybody" (*U* 12.1499-1501). Here, Joyce truly anonymizes the subjects and objects of social relations using "this" and "that" as unidentifiable references. Then, he includes all individuals in this web of social relations by stating that "everybody loves somebody." Lastly, he epitomizes ideal social relations by stating that "God loves everybody." Through the lens of cosmopolitan ethics, the message is clear: all people, including the second-person "you" mentioned a sentence before, are included in a social web which constitutes our "self." To word it in terms of literary theory, we consistently function in a Foucauldian panopticon created by communities of other social beings which each demonstrate and experience a Lacanian gaze. As a result, we must "love everybody" as God does in Joyce's sentence because we do not have access to their Ego-Ideal because our ideal ego, the result of the Lacanian gaze, clouds it in the same way that readers are led to define the people of Joyce's paragraph as Real rather than socially defined. In clearer terms: we are responsible for acting kindly in such a way that ignores socially constructed identities, like race and occupation, because we

cannot have access to the intrinsic individual, the way a person might think or act if not defined socially. Because we are all subject to the gazes of others – that is, we are all defined by the way others define us – we must understand that each of us defines those with whom we interact. To understand that each individual assists in constructing the self-definition of every other individual he or she meets is the root of Joyce’s cosmopolitan ethic.

Whereas Bloom, his declaration of love, and Joyce’s paragraph regarding interrelated lovers posit the benefits of cosmopolitan ethics, the citizen and his insistence on nationhood and race as that which truly defines Bloom represent the problems of nationalistic ethics. Bloom begins the discussion with the notion of persecution: “Persecution, says he, all the history of the world is full of it. Perpetuating national hatred among nations” (*U* 12.1417). In rebuttal, John Wyse Nolan asks “But do you know what a nation means?” (*U* 12.1419). Bloom replies in the affirmative (*U* 12.1420) and defines a nation as: “A nation? says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place” (*U* 12.1422). After Bloom speaks and “of course everyone had the laugh at Bloom” (*U* 12.1426), he qualifies his statement with “Or also living in different places” (*U* 12.1428), weakening his definition to the point of tautology. When asked for his nation by the citizen, Bloom replies plainly: “Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland” (*U* 12.1431). Bloom begins the conversation with a standard critique of nationalistic ethos in language appropriate for a pub scene, a generalization about “all the history of the world” without specific citations or examples.

Instead of attacking him by providing a counter-example or citing his lack of specificity, John Wyse Nolan, a nationalistic bar patron, questions Bloom's definition of a nation. Persecution and hatred are clearly unethical; as a result, the "weakness" in Bloom's cosmopolitan ethics is his inability to invent a definition for the complicated concept of "a nation" in the course of a conversation. Nolan, the citizen, and their compatriots conclude that Bloom cannot argue against nationalistic ethos if he cannot define a nation, even as they do not posit an alternative definition to Bloom's pedantic attempt. Indeed, the lack of definability deflates Bloom's argument and, in the eyes of the bar patrons, is positive proof for the utility of nationalistic ethics. In a desperate attempt to make the notion of a nation understandable, Bloom reduces his complicated nationality and race to the place he was born: Ireland, repeated for emphasis. In reiterating his nation as entity, Bloom affirms nationality as existent and tangible in a way that confirms the status quo – that is, rather than arguing for a more cosmopolitan ethic by complicating his nationality in such a way that its intangible nature illustrates the arbitrary distinctions necessary in creating a nationalistic ethics, he is rhetorically tricked into confirming nationalistic ethics as a means to demonstrate that he understands nationalism. At this point in the conversation, it would have set his argument back further if he grasped at a more complicated nationhood, possibly eliciting more laughter from the bar patrons. Walkowitz performs a close reading of the same scene and comes to this conclusion:

Ned Lambert and Joe Hynes make fun of Bloom for speaking of place, as in mapped geography or legal territory, because they consider it too vague, transient, and inclusive as a test of national belonging: people can change countries as easily as some people change houses, and, as patriots, they want national identity to be less easily acquired and less easily lost than, for example, property. (Walkowitz 75)

It is their commitment to their nationalistic ethics that makes it impossible for the pub patrons to comprehend Bloom's unexpected assertion of a country's mutability as being a potentially serious suggestion. They have no impetus to examine the notion that nationhood might be an inaccessible signified: they have no need to provide a counter-definition to Bloom's definition because, to a group that comprehends only through the lens of nationalism, Bloom's definition is too ludicrous to warrant serious consideration.

To include both types of language – cosmopolitan and nationalistic – creates “ceaseless movement of perspective [which] allows Joyce to display and appropriate the paralyzing norms of colonial Dublin” (Walkowitz 61). Walkowitz theorizes that Joyce's choice to “refuse to censor the less heroic, less salubrious aspects of Dublin life” and “refuse to present these experiences with requisite condemnation or care” was volitional; he knew that he was promoting hostility (58). For Walkowitz, this action is Joyce “subtracting consensus” – that is, writing discomforting literature in the typically modernist goal of challenging commonplace ideology (58). In this case, the nationalistic ethics as portrayed by

the pub patrons excluding Bloom is the ideology challenged by the direct juxtaposition of characters like Nolan and the citizen to Bloom. By using juxtaposition as the primary tool for representation in the Cyclops chapter, Joyce avoids explicitly advocating one system of ethics over the other. Emer Nolan notes in *James Joyce and Nationalism* that “the entire critical history of reading Bloom’s as the sole rational voice in this episode, and as a brave advocate of liberalism...seems to me to be deeply flawed” (96). Bloom’s “sole rational voice” is “flawed” in that his audience, the bar patrons, cannot connect his words to his cosmopolitan signifiers. His enthymematic argumentation excludes enough that the bar patrons cannot relate to or sympathize with his views.

Derrida outlines this type of argumentation: in this case, ethical argumentation through rhetoric “cannot be subsumed under the concepts whose contours it draws, [it] leaves only its ghost to a logic that can only seek to govern it insofar as logic arises from it—one would then have to *bend [plier]* into strange contortions what could no longer even simply be called logic or discourse” (“Plato’s Pharmacy” 103). I am intentionally misrepresenting Derrida here. In his original argument, he is speaking of writing, not ethical argumentation. However, in this passage, to speak of writing and ethical argumentation is to speak of the same thing. To better understand this, we return to Barthes, as he defines language as “the treasure deposited by the practice of speech, in the subjects belonging to the same community.”

Language is communally defined. In the Cyclops episode, Bloom is excluded in a

number of ways from the bar patrons' community. Mark Osteen outlines this exclusion in terms of gift exchange:

...the spenders and speakers in Kiernan's pub resemble Polyphemus, exchanging "gifts" that are at once obligatory and oppugnant. By their lights, Leopold Bloom, the Dublin Odysseus, breaks the rules of hospitality and reciprocity: according to Bloom, they are barbaric and their gifts destructive. Like Odysseus, Bloom is capable of creating pseudonyms; unlike Odysseus, his anonymity is dictated in part by his peers' refusal to recognize him as one of them. (Osteen 253)

Another critic, Kimberly Devlin, notes that Bloom is additionally separated from the pub community by his Jewish heritage:

...Jewishness is troped in anti-Semitic ideologies in much the same terms as femininity is troped in sexist ideologies and Easternness is troped in Orientalist discourse—as artifice, duplicity, mask: the reductive and absolute opposite of the "authentic" subject, which is normatively Christian, masculine, and Western. Bloom's need to "pass" in this fantasmic thus consolidates the ideological myth that Jewishness is not actually an "other" or alternative identity at all, because it is a non-identity. (Devlin 55)

Both critics astutely designate Bloom's "otherness" as not only the traditional definition of an Other, an out-group persecuted by the group controlling the

present-day dominant ideology, but instead as anonymous or as “a non-identity.” Also, both Osteen and Devlin note that Bloom becomes anonymous or a non-identity through the force of the community he encounters in Kiernan’s pub. Osteen claims that Bloom is anonymized by his refusal to acquiesce to the unspoken communal ethos of gift exchange; Devlin claims that Bloom’s Jewish nationality excludes him from constructing an identity in an Irish pub. With the help of these critics, it is easy to understand why Bloom has difficulty assigning a specific definition to “a nation”: he is not a part of a nation nor opposed to a nation, but, in fact, excluded entirely. With neither a positive or negative example of nationhood available to the nationless Jew, Bloom’s definition of nationhood is expectedly pedantic, eliciting social ostracizing from the ideological in-group formed at Kiernan’s pub.

With this noted, we return to Barthes’ definition of language. Because, as post-structuralist critics note, meaning in language is consistently deferred so that it can occasionally become inaccessible, the subjects who belong to the same community construct language in such a way that has cultural touchstones which delimit the deferral of meaning. Between Bloom and the bar patrons, no such communal connection exists to delimit the deferral of meaning – Bloom’s participation in the conversation amounts to a struggle to define terms in such a way that his non-identity is non-evident. He fails to do so. Because of his failure, the proponents of nationalist ethics rhetorically dominate Bloom with “strange contortions [that] could no longer even simply be called logic or

discourse,” but they merely gain the advantage as a result of Bloom’s inability to grasp their communal language (“Plato’s Pharmacy” 103). Although the ghost of logic is visible – the superficial structure of the discussion seems like a logical argument where the bar patrons win and Bloom loses – it is a mask of specificity which serves only to again reduce Bloom’s identity. As noted earlier, identities are created through the process of communal definition. The gaze of social acquaintances, such as Bloom’s acquaintances in the pub, creates identity. Nolan and the citizen reduce Bloom to a non-entity because their nationalistic ethic dictates that a man’s identity must be tied to his nation.

Because of his non-identity, Bloom has no choice but to support cosmopolitan ethics, an ethical system which excludes nationality and race as important factors. His inability to articulate this ethical system to the nationalistic bar patrons does not mean that Joyce supported nationalism and not cosmopolitanism; on the contrary, Joyce posits Bloom as a sympathetic character in this scene, a character who seems good-natured and well-intentioned but is unable to precisely state what he truly means. It is a consequence of accurate characterization, not ethical choice, that Bloom looks outmatched in the pub argument. To present Bloom as an expert orator on matters of nationhood would be disingenuous. As a nationless man, his communal experience does not give him the words necessary to signify a cosmopolitan ethic because he cannot fully understand nationalism, cosmopolitanism’s opposite.

In "On Cosmopolitanism," Derrida quotes Hannah Arendt, who speaks of the utopian nature of cosmopolitan ethics:

...contrary to the best-intentioned humanitarian attempts to obtain new declarations of human rights from international organizations, it should be understood that this idea transcends the *present sphere of international law which still operates in terms of reciprocal agreements and treaties between sovereign states*; and, for the time being, a sphere that is above the nations does not exist. Furthermore, this dilemma would by no means be eliminated by the establishment of a 'world government.' ("On Cosmopolitanism" 8-9)

Derrida adds that it is "necessary to expand upon and refine what she says of groups and individuals who, between the two wars, lost *all status* – not only their citizenship but even the title of 'stateless people'" (9). Derrida goes on to argue for the implementation of 'open cities' where migrants may seek sanctuary from persecution and exile, but Dublin is no open city. Bloom makes the case for the persecution he suffers:

--And I belong to a race, too, says Bloom, that is hated and persecuted.

Also now. This very moment. This very instant.

Gob, he near burnt his fingers with the butt of his old cigar.

--Robbed, says he. Plundered. Insulted. Persecuted. Taking what belongs to us by right. At this very moment, says he, putting up his fist,

sold by auction in Morocco like slaves or cattle.

--Are you talking about the new Jerusalem? says the citizen.

--I'm talking about injustice, says Bloom.

--Right, says John Wyse. Stand up to it then with force like men. (*U*
12.1467-75)

Here, Bloom once again attempts to engage the bar patrons in a language they understand: the language of race, a necessarily defined term in nationalistic ethics. Bloom uses the language of immediacy ("Also now. This very moment. This very instant.") in the hope of currying favor with his opposition, speaking in a staccato, asyndetic construction in order to emphasize the contemporaneous occurrence of Jewish persecution. Predictably, if one has been following my argument, his language is entirely lost on the citizen whose communal touchstones do not allow for the consideration of a cosmopolitan ethic – an ethic that allows for a nationless race such as Jews to avoid persecution. Even when Bloom breaks his meaning into synonymic repetition, as if speaking to a non-native speaker of English, the citizen misinterprets Bloom's aim, slipping again between signifier and signified in a way that ignores the "invisible interior" of Bloom's intent. The citizen interprets Bloom in a way he can understand him by asking, in essence, "in what way does this contribute to my nationalistic ethic?" by inquiring about the "new Jerusalem." To the citizen, Bloom cannot simply be declaring the necessity of kindness in handling out-groups because the notion of an out-group (or, even more abstract, a non-identity like Bloom) has no traction

in a nationalistic ethics. Scapegoats do not have such a title because the process of creating a scapegoat occurs without having language to describe the process critically. The existence of such a language, the language Bloom attempts to insert into the pub conversation, is ironically non-communicable. That is, it is impossible for a scapegoat to inform a nationalistic oppressor that he is a scapegoat. If adequate communication was possible, the nationalistic oppressor would cease oppressing. When Bloom is finally able to convey some semblance of his meaning, using yet another word – “injustice” – the response he garners is crude and nationalistic. Nolan’s solution to the violence committed against nationless groups and marginalized populations is reductive and simple: “Stand up to it then with force like men.” Contrary to cosmopolitan ethics, nationalistic ethics solves “injustice” not with the force of language and reason but instead with the force of violence. It is impossible for Nolan and his nationalistic ethic to consider solving the problems of a cultural minority by discussing the problem critically and working out a solution. To him, if an out-group deserves to be treated equally, it needs to fight for equality, regardless of its inherent disadvantage. Nolan and the citizen succeed in dissolving yet another of Bloom’s attempts to construct an identity in nationalistic/racial terms by Othering him once more, noting his feminized character. Bloom lacks definition in gender – his feminized characteristics are discussed immediately after Nolan notes that “men” are the people capable of standing up for themselves “with force.” In the nationalistic ethic, the force of violence is achievable only by “men,” an

ideological construction propagated and predicated on difference, the same type of out-grouping necessary to the survival of a nationalistic ethics. The group dynamic visible in the pub is predicated on the differences between Irish men like Nolan and Bloom, a man with ambiguous race and gender. Nationalists build strong social ties within in their in-groups by promoting the superiority of a well-defined nation and a well-defined gender.

The narrator comments on the contents of this conversation in the next paragraph, continuing to feminize Bloom:

That's an almanac picture for you. Mark for a softnosed bullet. Old lardyface standing up to the business end of a gun. Gob, he'd adorn a sweepingbrush, so he would, if he only had a nurse's apron on him. And then he collapses all of a sudden, twisting around all the opposite, as limp as a wet rag. (*U* 12.1475-80)

Here, Joyce once again invokes the image of the sweepingbrush, a brush that nearly blinded the narrator in the beginning of the episode. The one-eyed/I narrator represents the lack of perspective inherent in nationalistic ethic he embodies, a vision of the world without the depth necessary to understand its ideological pitfalls. By describing Bloom as a feminized cleaner with a "nurse's apron," the text continues to demonstrate the need to create a palpable difference between the in-group men in the pub and the out-grouped Bloom. The narrator describes Bloom in terms he understands because of his

nationalistic worldview: terms of difference, of impotence, "limp as a wet rag," insults meant to harm those who hold dear their socially defined gender roles. The narrator, who controls the language of the episode, fails to understand cosmopolitan ethics because he does not have a language for them. When he insults Bloom, he insults not Bloom's intrinsic character but instead the social definitions placed on Bloom by members of the pub who are also members of a nationalistic in-group. Bloom's attempts to explain his ethics are lost as the meaning is lost between signifier and signified. Because of this, the narrator couches Bloom and his ethics in terms he can understand, in terms which dissolve Bloom's identity into feminine stereotypes and imagery implying impotence. In order to encourage in-grouping, simple totems are necessary to distinguish in from out. Here, a "nurse's apron" and the implication of a "limp" phallus are used to identify Bloom as an outsider.

Bloom continues to distance himself from the pub patrons with a declaration of universal love drenched in terms inextricable from cosmopolitan ethics:

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

--What? says Alf.

--Love, says Bloom. I mean the opposite of hatred. I must go now, says he to John Wyse. Just round to the court a moment to see if Martin is

there. If he comes just say I'll be back in a second. Just a moment.
Who's hindering you? And off he pops like greased lightning.
--A new apostle to the gentiles, says the citizen. Universal love.
--Well, says John Wyse. Isn't that what we're told. Love your neighbour.
--That chap? says the citizen. Beggar my neighbour is his motto. Love,
moya! He's a nice pattern of a Romeo and Juliet. (U 12.1481-92)

When Bloom begins this quotation with "it's no use," he's referring to Nolan's masculine suggestion that Jewish and other oppressed peoples "stand up to it...with force like men" (U 12.1475). In this case, Bloom's resignation to the utility in violence may also be read as resignation in the hope of convincing any pub patron with his argumentation. Only a few lines later, after a punctuated line of argumentation, Bloom decides to leave the pub. Instead of bothering to explicate his informal dictum on universal love, Bloom continues with his staccato listing: "Force, hatred, history, all that." By dropping only tangentially-related loaded nouns, Bloom again creates what Derrida calls a "ghost to a logic that can only seek to govern it insofar as logic arises from it" ("Plato's Pharmacy" 103). In other words, Bloom's form of argumentation appeals only to stakeholders who already support it; the same can be said of Nolan and the citizen's argumentation. When readers search for the *logos* of Bloom's argument, the only support we find for his claim is an *argumentum ad populum*. Because "everybody knows" that "love" is "that that is really life," Bloom supports,

perhaps naively, the idea that universal love – “the opposite of hatred” – is fundamentally possible.

Joyce exhibits his praise of cosmopolitanism not in the ghost of *logos* but the evident *pathos* and *ethos* embodied by Bloom and the pub patrons. When the narrator thinks “Who’s hindering you?” before Bloom leaves the pub, he commits the classic error of the oppressed: the inability to locate the oppressor. In this instance, the most evident oppressor is the narrator and his friends; their conversation with Bloom is unpleasant. No one could blame Bloom for wanting to depart. In the context of the greater conversational topic, however, “Who’s hindering you?” reads differently. Who hinders the admittedly lofty goal of universal love? To this point Derrida writes:

How might [cosmopolitan intentions] respond to unprecedented tragedies and injunctions which serve to constrain and hinder [them]? ... Is it possible to enumerate the multiplicity of menaces, of acts of censorship or of terrorism, of persecutions and of enslavements in all their forms? The victims of these are innumerable and nearly always anonymous, but increasingly they are what one refers to as intellectuals, scholars, journalists, and writers – men and women capable of speaking out (*porter une parole*) – in a public domain that the new powers of telecommunication render increasingly formidable – to police forces of all countries, to the religious, political, economic, and social forces of

censorship and repression, whether they be state-sponsored or not. ("On
 Cosmopolitanism" 5-6)

The scope of this paper does not allow for the social scientific methodology required to inspect the "police forces" or the "religious, political, [and] economic" forces of censorship and repression evident in 1904 Dublin, but Derrida gives his readers language for oppression that the Cyclops narrator and the pub patrons do not have. A social force can censor and repress so significantly that it is worth being mentioned in the same breath as police oppression. Bloom experiences this firsthand as his attempt to voice a cosmopolitan view is rejected by the pub patrons. Through the vehicle of social oppression, Bloom experiences a subtype of social oppression that I have been explicating throughout this essay: semiotic oppression. The clash at the pub occurs because of what we might colloquially refer to as a "misunderstanding." The misunderstanding occurs on the level of language as both sides do not elaborate their positions in any detail. Bloom's depiction of cosmopolitanism is a disorganized musing rather than a formalized argument; likewise, the pub patrons are more interested in challenging Bloom's masculinity than elaborating concretely their nationalistic positions. Bloom's cosmopolitan ideas, radical but unformed, are restricted by the patrons' inability to connect his signifiers – disjointed and unexplained nouns like "force," "hatred," "history," and the vaguely summarizing "all that." Their response is aggressive and oppressive throughout the conversation. By asking the question "Who's hindering you?" and referring only to Bloom's presence in

the pub and not the wider implications, the hinderers who systematically restrict the implementation of multicultural policies that would benefit those whose national or racial identities do not please the hegemonic Powers That be, the Cyclops narrator reveals his semiotic bias. His signifiers are unable to signify an understanding of systematic nationalistic oppression even when he thinks the potentially signifying words in a potentially signifying order. The narrator is too local and too pragmatic to incorporate the same level of meta-cognition about his own language that Bloom displays throughout chapters in which we receive information about his internal monologue. "Who's hindering you" occurs in the narrator's internal monologue as a wink to an audience that reads Bloom as the victim of the oppressive pub patrons. Joyce poses the rhetorical question ironically as the audience has more knowledge about the narrator's unintentional insinuation than the narrator does in his own muted thoughts. To present the rhetorical question in his internal monologue rather than including it in dialogue emphasizes the character's inability to connect his signifiers to non-nationalistic signified meanings. Because complicated verbal communication requires so many simultaneous mental processes, we have become accustomed to forgiving gaps in verbalized expression. An internal monologue, however, is the perfect and expected place for characters to work out the intricate meanings of their thoughts. The following sentence – "And off he pops like greased lightning" – confirms that the narrator was only conceiving of hindrance in its most local formulation. His sarcastic thought refers only to Bloom's departure from the pub

and the knowledge that all of the patrons were indifferent or preferred to see him leave. To the narrator, Bloom is as unhindered as "greased lightning." For readers interested in cosmopolitanism, this fundamental misunderstanding represents a semiotic collision represented through dramatic irony and created by the character's entrenched nationalistic ideology.

After Bloom's departure, the citizen calls him a "new apostle to the gentiles" preaching "universal love." About this phrase Gifford annotates the following: "St. Paul, who, after his conversion to Christianity, preached the gospel to all without distinction of race or nation" (364). Unlike the narrator, the citizen seems more aware of the semiotic links that Bloom builds with his statements by making an allusion to St. Paul's explicitly multiracial and multinational missionary cause. For a brief moment, we are led to believe that Bloom's disjointed speech about love had a profound effect on the citizen. Although the sentence's tone is evidently sarcastic, there is an implied semiotic breakthrough: the citizen finally conceives of Bloom's nationhood as being restrictive to the spread of universal love in the same way that nations and races restricted St. Paul's ability to spread the word of God. Although it is ostensibly a breakthrough, this new understanding is immediately undercut by the following lines. It should not have surprised readers, however, that the citizen's understanding of cosmopolitan ethics have not drastically improved. The citizen's mode of understanding Bloom's ethics circumscribes the cosmopolitan ethic in a Christian analogy. He attempts to use the propagation of an

oppressive hegemonic power – *the* oppressive hegemonic power critiqued so heavily in Joyce's *Portrait* – as an adequate analogy for the dissolution of the hegemony to allow for the benefit of oppressed peoples. It is not adequate. By understanding cosmopolitanism only through the lens of religion, a force that divides people in the same manner as nationhood or racial differences, the citizen cannot conceive of Bloom's signifiers as connecting to the greater cosmopolitan signified.

"Love your neighbour," though, is a Christian ideal, as posited by John Wyse Nolan, but why does understanding cosmopolitanism through the lens of Christianity inhibit the citizen's capability to reach Bloom's cosmopolitan signified meaning? Christianity marks a fidelity to a particularized form of God both written and implied; the typically cosmopolitan ethic replaces one's primary allegiance to God or country with a "primary allegiance is to the community of human beings in the entire world" (Nussbaum). Ascribing to a Christian faith does not automatically preclude one from holding a cosmopolitan ethic. However, in order to hold both ethical systems, it is necessary to adjust them both such that they fit. The citizen does not do so, and he makes this evident in his response to Nolan's proposal that Bloom's cosmopolitan teachings actually correlate with Irish Catholic learnings. "Beggan my neighbour is his motto," the citizen states. Gifford informs us that Beggan My Neighbour is a "card game for two children in which the object is to gain all of the opponent's cards" (364). The tie to cosmopolitanism here is obvious. The citizen claims that Bloom's

actions do not coalesce with his words, that Bloom may preach universal love but would, in the practical world, do his best to benefit himself rather than benefit others.

Bloom's naïve hope in universal love reiterates his cosmopolitan position in words that he has considered in the previous episode while listening to "The Croppy Boy":

I too. Last of my race. Milly young student. Well, my fault perhaps. No son. Rudy. Too late now. Or if not? If not? If still?

He bore no hate.

Hate. Love. Those are names. Rudy. Soon I am old.

[...]

Ireland comes now. My country above the king. (*U* 11.1066-72)

Bloom responds to "The Croppy Boy" with a brief musing on love, hate, race, age, and country. The lines "He bore no hate" and "My country above my king" are not thoughts generated by Bloom but instead quoted from the song itself (Gifford 308). Bloom realizes it may be too late to procreate, to produce an heir to his mixed, indefinite race, the conglomeration of a Jew without devotion to his religion and an Irishman without devotion to his country. His rhetorical questioning ("Or if not? If not? If still?") sounds hopeful but is ultimately undermined by the next sentence, taken from "The Croppy Boy" as an expression of Bloom's resignation: "He bore no hate." In the original song, a

son is confessing to his priest, apologizing for forgetting to pray over his mother's grave and declaring his nationalistic pride by stating his country is above "[his] king." It is impossible to read this apology without being reminded of Stephen's refusal to pray for the sake of his dying mother as explicated in the first episode. Albeit tangentially related, this connection reinforces an important point: extreme and unquestioned devotion to one's cause, whether it is the pub patrons' nationalism or Stephen's religious refusal, has serious consequences for people other than the zealot himself. In Stephen's case, he undoubtedly creates heartbreak in his mother. In the case of the pub patrons, their zealotry for nationalism culminates in a physical fight with Bloom. Bloom exhibits the opposite of zealotry: he bears no hate for his adulterous wife, the pub patrons, or even Blazes Boylan. His middling nature, the tendency to weigh all possibilities in a situation without committing to a particular stance, is what helps to create his cosmopolitan persona. He does not have the demeanor to commit to the defense of a nation because his mode of understanding requires inquiry into what seems to the pub nationalists to be self-evidently true: nationhood is simple and your devotion is expected. Bloom, who muses on both the sacred and profane throughout the novel, will not allow the pub patrons' concept of nationhood to pass without at least a failed attempt to nuance it.

What, then, is the consequence of simplifying Bloom's identity through the process of nationalistic Othering? In Derrida's words, Bloom is one of the "stateless people," emblemizing the Wandering Jew in Joyce's *Ulysses* yet

unable to even fully claim his race, as doing so unwittingly enters him into dialogue with a nationalistic ethics which makes him stateless. Likewise, when Bloom lays claim to Irish nationality, the citizen "said nothing" and spits into the corner, rejecting a fellow 'citizen' who does not speak the language of nationalistic ethics. Derrida's hope for "open cities" that welcome the persecuted and ostracized faces a methodological problem: with a world politic enveloped in nationalistic language, the creation of a cosmopolitan ethic faces naturalized resistance in that the language does not exist to depict true post-national and post-racial thought. To create an "open city" would be to dissolve the notion of cities belonging to a particular nation. To dissolve that notion, a shift in the dominant ideology of sovereignty is necessary. Joyce illuminates the difficulty of establishing a shift in language by illustrating the one-eyed nature of those who cannot understand the benefits of a cosmopolitan ethics because cosmopolitan signifiers do not link with the nationalistic signified.

3. Joyce's Early Critics' Recognition of Cosmopolitanism

According to Rebecca Walkowitz, "recent work on Joyce's cosmopolitanism has tended to privilege narrative themes of hybridity, border crossing, and cultural inauthenticity over narrative forms of perversity, decadence, and artifice" (55). Early critics recognized these motifs in Joyce's work before the advent of the term "cosmopolitanism" by acknowledging that Joyce was not an author neatly defined by the nation he depicted in his major works. Norreys Jephson O'Connor, in 1934, discusses Joyce in relation to his exile, emphasizing how Joyce's "anticolonial" (56) formal experimentation caused younger Irish writers to explore extranational interpretive modes, such as Russian formalism, to escape the simultaneous constraints of British colonial oppression and Irish nationalist identity, an "atmosphere" of "trouble" which adversely affected their literary endeavors:

Younger writers, brought up in the atmosphere of what is euphuistically called "trouble" in their search for realism turned toward Russian and other Continental authors--an attitude strengthened by the experimentation and the growing reputation of James Joyce. The internal difficulties of the island resulted in a collapse of intellectual life: A.E.'s admirable periodical, the *Irish Statesmen*, had to be abandoned, a

ensorship of literature was established, and nearly all the leading writers of the older generation left the country. (O'Connor 234)

The content of Joyce's writing includes explicit accounts of other cultures – the bazaar in the *Dubliners* story "Araby," for example – but Joyce's cosmopolitan ethic is more readily apparent in his form and literary influences. Unlike Flann O'Brien, an Irish writer who adapted Irish myths for his works, Joyce's mythic method employed a retelling of a Greek's journey which collapses a twenty-year known-world-wide odyssey into a day-long city-wide series of events. Joyce expands on the styles of non-Irish and non-English authors Ibsen and Flaubert, and experiments in realism using influences that challenged the Irish understanding of their colonial status. In the Oxen of the Sun chapter of *Ulysses*, Joyce criticizes the development of English prose by exposing the modern state of the English language as "a frightful jumble of pidgin English...Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel" ("Letters" 138-39). One difficulty the younger Irish writers faced was the "trouble" of an imposed language in a paralyzed colony, and O'Connor recognizes Joyce's apt reaction to the state of colonial Ireland: escape, both geographically and stylistically.

In his work "On Cosmopolitanism" Derrida writes about the ongoing calls for "cities of refuge" – safe, open cities where refugees can flee from oppression. Anticipating this, Joyce self-exiles to cities open to accepting him, freeing him insofar as he can construct literary critiques of colonial oppression from the perspective of a cosmopolitan citizen in cities like Trieste, thereby avoiding the

"collapse of intellectual life" that O'Connor observes and A.E. experiences. Joyce's choices in his self-imposed exile and his literary influences helped him to become a model for avoiding the literary bankruptcy of Ireland and for the necessity to look elsewhere for literary experimentation unaffected by the oppression of colonial power. Long before Derrida had advocated the notion of 'open cities,' Joyce had sought refuge in Trieste and Zurich in order to avoid the type of political oppression which censors controversial periodicals and causes experimental artists to dampen their efforts for ideological reasons. In *The Years of Bloom*, John McCourt asserts Joyce stayed in Trieste for so many years because of "the Eastern atmosphere, the mix of peoples from 'all the ends of Europe,' the linguistic mishmash, and the multifarious activity of a bustling port city" (4). For McCourt, Joyce appreciated Trieste "as a multilingual, multi-ethnic, multicultural and multi-religious reality, a rich field to observe" for an author who placed the bustling cultural hodgepodge experienced in his self-exile into the more homogeneous Dublin metropolis. Early critics like O'Connor already recognized the Irish "trouble" which cultivated a cosmopolitan ethic in Joyce's life and work. When Joyce's Trieste-inspired multicultural subject Leopold Bloom is fictionally inserted into a Dublin pub, he experiences one facet of what Joyce considered Dublin paralysis: the blindly nationalistic cheerleading led by the citizen whose exchange with Bloom microcosmically represents the "trouble" that both Joyce and O'Connor observed as an inevitable consequence for artists living in Dublin. Artists had to contend with a colony sociologically paralyzed by an

oppressive hegemony. Joyce, the escaped artist, was capable of detailing the ways in which the oppressive Dublin society rejects multicultural, cosmopolitan characters like Bloom. Bloom is rejected because of the dissolution of the binary between the psychological self and the sociological nation. The rejection is exposed by characters like the citizen whose signifiers are intimately linked to nationalistic signified concepts. The "trouble" that O'Connor observes is just that: in a city where autonomous identity is dissolved into the homogenous populace by force of language, it is impossible to construct art of the highest caliber. In this case, the Derridian force of language is self-censorship imposed by readers like the men in the pub. Paralyzed Irish art was created to be seen and appreciated by a populace who cannot appreciate ambiguities or contradictions inherent in the roles socially assigned to enforce the nationalistic ethic. In this way, art could not truthfully express the nuances visible by the self-exiled Joyce. The young Dublin artists and O'Connor intuited this bankruptcy of cosmopolitan language as an internal struggle which caused the flight of older artists who, like Joyce, left the island in search of artistic subjects like those in Trieste and cosmopolitan influences which would eventually shape their major works.

In 1933, Francis Watson asserted that Joyce viewed nationalism as a potential danger on par with Joyce's common subject of religious oppression. Watson compares oppressive nationalistic ethics as criticized in *Ulysses's* Cyclops episode alongside the heavy-handed observations of artistic deadening caused by organized Catholicism in *Portrait*:

For Joyce, in one sense a greater figure of the Irish Revival than Yeats, has never allowed himself to be directly associated with a national movement, nor to be influenced by an exclusive body of literary practitioners. Nationalism has seemed to him as dangerous to intellectual freedom as religion, and the two forces have parallel importance in his maturity. ("Portrait" 102)

Although Joyce focuses on Ireland as his primary geographical locale in all of his major works, his recreation of Dublin is unflattering to its culture and citizenry. As noted by Kieran Keohane, Joyce "signs off *Ulysses* as written in 'Trieste, Zurich, Paris, 1914-1921,' but yet when asked once if he would ever return home to Dublin, he replied, 'Have I ever left it?'" (30). By extricating himself physically but not mentally from his home, Joyce is able to recreate Dublin from the perspective of a traveler with a life affected by the cosmopolitan cities of Trieste, Zurich, and Paris. Joyce may have brought about an aesthetic revival for artists and demonstrated that dear dirty Dublin could produce an artist of international renown, yet his intellectual projects rest heavily on his ability to see Dublin and Irish culture as an outsider. Joyce the exile, as Watson put it in another publication also published in 1933, is capable of directly freeing himself from nationalistic idioms and indirectly freeing Irish revivalists from their illusory Celticism:

One of the services which James Joyce rendered to the Irish literary revival with which he refused to associate himself was to free it from sentimentality. ("Nest" 639)

Extricating himself from Dublin and its culture, Joyce gained the opportunity and knowledge to critique Dublin appropriately as a world traveler and not as a revivalist living in the nation he hoped to 'revive.' In other words, Joyce's cosmopolitan ethic – a view of Dublin with one eye on the city and one eye on the rest of the world – allows Joyce to write with a level of objectivity that challenges sentimental works like Yeats' *The Celtic Twilight*. Joyce's aesthetic project is thus separate from his ideological project; his books are not written with the purpose of promoting the appealing aspects about Irish nationhood. To the Irish Revival, Joyce represented an Irishman capable of outstanding aesthetic creation who stands outside of the movement, who lacks the ideological purpose of revivalists who inextricably connect their aesthetic efforts to the promotion of a particular nation. To be a cosmopolitan writer gives Joyce the freedom to experiment, as Watson implies, with unlimited literary influences, and an intellectual freedom which helps to create the myriad voices and ideological positions evident in *Ulysses* and the soon-to-be-published *Finnegans Wake* (1939).

Early critics recognized Joyce's effort to create what Derrida calls an "open city" in his recreation of Dublin. For example, David Daiches observes the following in 1940:

Joyce must make Dublin into a microcosm of the world so that he can raise his distance from that city into an aesthetic attitude...[the narrative becomes] symbolic of the activity of man in the world, not simply descriptive of a group of individual men in Dublin. (Daiches 203)

In the *Fortnightly Review*, Stuart Gilbert, too, considers Joyce's depiction of Dublin to represent in microcosm a city which encourages the hybridity and border crossing typical of a cosmopolitan ethic:

Ulysses is like a great net let down upon the life of a microcosmic city-state, Dublin, wherein lie captured all sorts and conditions of men and minds. Nothing in the tale is, for the author of *Ulysses*, common or unclean, for he sees the protean manifold of phenomena bound together by the rhythm of universal law, an application of the Hermetic precept: That which is above is as that which is below and that which is below is as that which is above. (Gilbert 47)

Joyce's ability to accentuate minor characters, such as characters both speaking and mentioned in the Cyclops episode, allows him to represent differing minds which fall on either side of the nationalism/cosmopolitanism spectrum. Bloom's foils in the pub -- most notably the citizen, named explicitly for his nationalistic ethic -- appear aggressive and rude, characters whom the reader might consider too "common or unclean" for less experimental, revivalist authors in Joyce's time period (Gilbert 47). In *Ulysses*, these characters are threads in the tapestry of

the microcosmic: they exist as a means to detail the nationalistic ethic and to emphasize the brighter colors of Bloom's endorsement of cosmopolitanism. Like Nolan, the citizen speaks only with nationalistic signifiers. After Bloom fails to define "a nation," the citizen rebukes him with a question: "What is your nation if I may ask, says the citizen" (*U* 12.1430). The notion that Bloom's nationhood could be more complicated does not pass the citizen's mind, and Bloom repeats "Ireland" twice in another attempt to speak using nationalistic semiotics. The citizen, like the rest of the pub patrons, uses language not "common or unclean" but instead the language that paralyzed Ireland: words that bully out-group members and those which make light of Bloom's notion of "universal love" (*U* 12.1489). Unlike the Irish revivalists, Joyce portrays in his characters both a worldly and national perspective. The national perspective is less sympathetically portrayed than the worldly. Bloom, who might be better suited for Trieste than Dublin, exemplifies "the life of a microcosmic city-state, Dublin, wherein lie captured all sorts and conditions of men and minds" (Gilbert 47).

Joyce's experimentation looms so large over other Irish writers that early critics rarely compare him to his own countrymen. Instead, like O'Connor, Hughes Pennethorne, writing in 1934, compares Joyce to other experimental artists from Russia:

At the same time the application of the discoveries of psychoanalysis gave a sanction for emphasizing the latent content of words and their subsidiary associations, and even the presentation of complementary

ideas apparently utterly unconnected with the original poetic concept.

The same influence is apparent in all the arts, most manifestly perhaps in the literary technique of James Joyce and the cinematic technique of the big Russian directors, both techniques very generally and unintelligently copied and exploited. (Pennethorne 18)

Joyce invites comparisons to Russian artists while physically joining Europe during his self-imposed exile, a form of global citizenship. McCourt quotes Seamus Deane concerning Joyce's feelings toward patriotism: "patriotism needs service as the condition of its authenticity, and it is not sufficient to say 'I believe' unless one can say also 'I serve'" (99). For Joyce, servility is famously not an option, and to claim *non serviam* to one's country when writing texts that only reflect on one's own country invites cosmopolitan thought. That is, Joyce's content – a nation – is inspected using a cosmopolitan style given that he is unwilling to accept the coercion of nationalistic ethics. Walkowitz characterizes the salient features of modernist narrative that create a cosmopolitan ethic as being "wandering consciousness, paratactic syntax, recursive plotting, collage, and portmanteau language," all of which are evident in *Ulysses* (2). Notably, Pennethorne, writing much earlier than Walkowitz, indirectly highlights those literary devices as being essential to Joyce's success. When Pennethorne claims that "the latent content of words and their subsidiary associations, and even the presentation of complementary ideas apparently utterly unconnected with the original poetic concept" is a discovery utilized in Joyce's works, he describes

those modernist inventions employed to create cosmopolitan works. The “wandering consciousness” most evident in *Wandering Rocks*, the “paratactic syntax” most evident in *Sirens*, and the “recursive plotting,” “collage,” and “portmanteau language” exemplified throughout *Ulysses* depend on the reader’s capability to connect to the latent content of words and their subsidiary associations. In other words, Joyce’s stylistic choices noted by Pennethorne in 1934 reflect the cosmopolitan theory proposed by Walkowitz in 2006. It is expected, therefore, that Joyce’s comparisons would be extranational; the writers of the Irish revival would not have been able to subsume the qualities necessary to construct a text with a cosmopolitan ethic.

4. Conclusion

"[G]rowing up in Ireland meant for Joyce the gradual realization of the necessity for leaving his native land," wrote David Daiches in 1940 (197). Upon leaving, Joyce became an international artist, a writer whose personal boundaries extended well beyond the ostensible geographic confines in his works. His subject was always Dublin, but his treatment of Dublin was not composed from the perspective of a Dubliner. Scholars of the New Critical school in the United States treated Joyce's work as apolitical, a High Modernist literary experiment in which Joyce had inserted enough enigmas to keep a close reader at attention for a lifetime. Joyce's biography however – his many years spent in what McCourt calls the "cosmopolitan" Trieste – cannot be ignored. The Cyclops episode, which focuses so intensely on the concept of nationhood and the creation of a more cosmopolitan world, cannot be extricated from the politics of sovereignty. Although "*Ulysses* is the description of a limited number of events concerning a limited number of people in a limited environment," the experiences Joyce incorporates from his European travels "make Dublin into a microcosm of the world" as a means to create "distance from that city into an aesthetic attitude" (Daiches 203). He attempts to capture a portrait of the world in the place of one city, and his attempt to do so reveals the problems inherent in nationalistic ethics. Joyce is able to "privilege narrative themes of hybridity,

border crossing, and cultural inauthenticity over narrative forms of perversity, decadence, and artifice" in his novel (Walkowitz 55). However, he is also able to maintain the "perversity, decadence, and artifice" that mark nationalistic ethics by geographically planting his plot in a single city rather than having his characters match his biographical travels. By juxtaposing the nationalism of Dublin residents with the more international, more cosmopolitan Bloom, a protagonist who benefits from Joyce's personal experiences outside of Dublin, Joyce makes evident that nationalism, like organized religion, paralyzes the city.

Works Cited

- Barthes, Roland. *Elements of Semiology*. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Benjamin, Walter. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.
- Davison, Neil R. "'Cyclops,' Sinn Féin, and 'The Jew': An Historical Reconsideration." *Journal of Modern Literature*. 19.2 (Fall 1995): 245-57.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Force and Signification." *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- . *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Trans. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- . "Plato's Pharmacy." *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Daiches, David. "James Joyce: The Artist as Exile." *College English*. 2.3 (Dec 1940): 197-206.
- Devlin, Kimberly J. "Bloom and the Police: Regulatory Vision and Visions in 'Ulysses'." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*. 29.1 (Autumn 1995): 45-62.
- Gifford, Don with Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2008.
- Gilbert, Stuart. "An Irish Ulysses." *Fortnightly Review*. 126 (1929): 46-58. *British Periodicals*. Web. 15 Sep. 2012.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Ed. Hans Walter Gabler. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Keohane, Kieran. "The Revitalization of the City and the Demise of Joyce's Utopian Modern Subject." *Theory Culture Society*. 19.29 (2002): 29-49.
- Lacan, Jacques. "Of the Gaze as *Objet Petit a*." *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1981.

- McCourt, John. *The Years of Bloom: James Joyce in Trieste 1904-1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2000.
- Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." *Boston Review*. October/November 1994. 2 Apr 2013.
- O'Connor, Norreys Jephson. "The Trend of Anglo-Irish Literature." *The Bookman* (1934): 233-4. *British Periodicals*. Web. 30 Sep. 2012.
- Osteen, Mark. *The Economy of Ulysses: Making Both Ends Meet*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.
- Pennethorne, Hughes. "Obscurity, and the Next Phase, in English Poetry." *The Bookman*. (1934): 17-8. *British Periodicals*. Web. 30 Sep. 2012.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism Beyond the Nation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
- Watson, Francis. "A Nest of Simple Folk." *Fortnightly Review*. 138 (1933): 639-40. *British Periodicals*. Web. 5 Sep. 2012.
- Watson, Francis. "A Portrait of the Artist in Maturity." *The Bookman* 85.506 (1933): 102-5. *British Periodicals*. Web. 5 Sep. 2012.