Introduction

As in the case of anthropology, psychology has its own terms of reference which cannot always be harmoniously married to the criteria of literary criticism.

E. W. Herd

Myth criticism finds an uneasy perch on the tree of literary criticism (so to speak), though “upstarts” like structuralism and post-structuralism look like established “squatters.” Coming to the forefront as it did, with the advent of anthropology and psychology, myth criticism relies heavily on these external disciplines, and is apparently in divergence with the New Critical tenet of textual autonomy. Based on the premise that a suprarational, “mythically-unified” sensibility (Falck 159) is the basis of all human thinking, myth criticism projects the modern age to be a yearning for a return to origins in the past—a position which expresses most “patently a revival of romantic longings and attitudes” (Rahv 110) for a golden age which has vanished. One of the more comfortable assumptions about myth criticism is that it provides a perfect antidote to the dehumanization and alienation of the post-War world because it renews a sense of wonder and reduces the feeling of a loss of identity (Das 159). However, the tragic contradiction of historical development, says Rahv, is that “the pristine unity of thought and action, word and deed” (114) which is crucial to myth, was lost later. By constantly evoking the past, myth criticism encourages a regression from history and historical time to a timeless mythical reality as embodied in the concept of eternity. It becomes clear now that myth criticism and New Criticism share the same concern for what is timeless.
and ahistorical. In fact, the ahistorical tendencies of post-mythic thinking find their most adequate representative in myth criticism.

Stanley Edgar Hyman identifies 1912 as the “watershed year” in the history of myth criticism when both Frazer’s book, *The Golden Bough* and Jung’s *Psychology of the Unconscious* (Vickery, ML xi) became available to the “cultists of myth” (Rahv 109) as representative of the intellectual forces of anthropology and psychology. The myth critics appropriated the thought-provoking discoveries of these scientists, and the identification of the mythic pattern of the quest for Order became the hallmark of the critical trend which followed. It manifest itself in the “mythical method” spearheaded by Eliot’s valorization of the same, as he hailed it in Joyce’s *Ulysses* which, published as it was in 1922, only fuelled the prevailing “mythomania” (Rahv 109) of the over-zealous practitioners of myth criticism. The method, as the practice of the myth criticism interprets it, merely represents a “conjuncture of the most primitive and most sophisticated [which] is a stock formula of modernism . . .” (Eagleton 56). For the myth critics, Joyce’s novel served as an exemplary model of the methodology they were advocating, while Eliot gave further credence to their stance by ratifying the conjunction of the primitive with the contemporary as a method that would make the “modern world possible for art” (qtd. in Denham 271; vol.1). Most critics believe that Joyce’s use of the Homeric epic to narrate the story of modern Dublin illustrates this point.

The truth about myth criticism, probably, lies somewhere midway between the two positions outlined here. For instance, Feder claims that the “revolutionary approaches to myth of Frazer, Freud, Jung, and the various developments of their views by their followers have united the behaviour, the thoughts, the dreams and fantasies of the
twentieth-century man of letters with his primordial past” (7). On the other hand, there is a body of thought which believes that “Jung and Frazer do not have as much standing amongst recent scholars of mythology and comparative religion as they had two decades ago . . . Edmund Leach has lately questioned and refuted many of the assumptions of Frazer” (Das 165). What is important in the final count, however, is the direction given to the myth criticism of Ulysses by the “various developments” of the views of Frazer and Jung by their ‘disciples.’

The myth criticism of Ulysses is an outgrowth of the “Joyce Industry” (Staley 486) which spawned this ‘misbirth,’ --one of the related ‘developments’ in the history of Joyce criticism which merely compounded the problems inherent in this critical trend. In the beginning, Joyce studies were commonly devoted to a reading in the Gestalt mode (Stein 241), where plot and theme were discussed according to a wider framework. A post-war development, however, was the identification of details like specific episodes and individual figures (Adams 27), wherein analyses of these details became a more popular mode of interpretation, and single facets of the thematic whole were extracted from the entirety of the text for critical interpretation. Such exercises in abstraction render the analyses by myth critics meaningless. Archetypal elements are selectively chosen, and subjected to a critical attention that is disproportionate to their actual function in the text.

This trend was reinforced by the simultaneous growth of periodical criticism which saw periodicals like the James Joyce Quarterly coming into prominence. Specifically devoted to Joyce studies, the essays carried by this periodical only served to encourage the abstractification already prevalent. There was a spurt in Joyce studies as
articles were churned out at quarterly intervals. For instance, a particular detail like Stephen's search for artistic order is identified and isolated, and becomes the object of the full glare of critical attention. The myth criticism of *Ulysses* is characterized by a search for the mystical Order, an approach which is commonly categorized as "‘transcendentalist’" (Attridge and Ferrer 5). It usually relates the "discovered pattern to some universalized and universalizing structure - the Trinity, the epic journey, the Romance quest, the nuclear family, the Oedipus complex, the historical cycle, the stages of human life; by this means the potentially explosive text is endowed with order and significance of a wholly traditional kind" (Attridge and Ferrer 5). While general literary criticism comprehends this quest at the level of the "traditional" Homeric myth, and sees Stephen as Telemachus in search of his father Odysseus, myth criticism prefers to interpret Stephen's quest in the light of findings in anthropology and psychology, merely using different vocabularies to reiterate the same quest for order.

Stephen's quest in *Ulysses* thus becomes mythicized into Everyman's quest. Both the Blooms, Molly and Leopold, are seen as playing vital roles which intersect Stephen's life. So the archetypal nature of the father-son and the mother/lover-son/beloved relationships is overemphasized. The quest pattern, according to the myth critics, comprises the birth-death-rebirth scheme which underscores the recurrent nature of this search for order. In Stephen's personal life this is symbolized by his attempts at self-realization as an artist. As opposed to the pattern of change in the external world of history, the myth critics believe that the cyclicity of the world of myth promises a "reassuring ... stability" (Rahv 111) which, according to them, contains the panacea for the conflict-ridden twentieth century. The use of mythology thus becomes "not only an
appropriate way of experiencing the world, but a convenient way of trying to make sense of it” (Eagleton 56), which, in *Ulysses*, is embodied in the concept of Stephen’s self-realization.

Another contributory factor is the Irish Revivalist Movement which saw Yeats and other literary revivalists encouraging the nationalist movement through their writings. The glorified cause of Irish nationalism energised the efforts of the Irish nationalists who zealously tried to revive revolutionary zeal through the propagation of the lost glory of Ireland which, they believed, needed to be resurrected. The vigour with which they went about their self-imposed mission would, probably, have made a dead Ireland come alive. Seeing Yeats and Synge as intrinsic members of this movement, it became convenient to perceive Joyce as part of the same coterie. But Joyce, the “‘born sneerer’” (M Brown 10), needless to say, does not join the movement, though myth critics have the tendency of viewing *Ulysses* divorced from this aspect of Irish history. For in contrast to Yeats’ “effete Celticism” and “Anglo-Irish elitism” (T Brown 115, 119), the Joycean alternative indicates “how Irish identity can be re-formulated not in nationalistic fashion but in European and indeed universal modes which can liberate from myth conceived of in absolute terms, and from provincial stereotyping” (T Brown 120). Instead, the quest for Order in *Ulysses* is commonly comprehended as Joyce’s wishful longing for a utopia of wish fulfilment. Rarely do the myth critics realize that Joyce is actually ripping apart traditional notions of nostalgia and nationalism, ironically exposing political and religious structures for the hypocritical institutions that they were. Joyce does not establish any artificial sense of Order; on the other hand, he exposes that all is disorder in the country of Ireland as well as in Stephen, the Irish national. Unlike the
nationalists who believed passionately in their own myths and stories, Joyce keeps away from such self-deluding tactics, exposing instead, the "mendacious patriotism" of the nationalist movement, which enabled it to "glorify ridiculous myths" (Bolt 13).

A marked characteristic of the myth criticism of Ulysses which is related to the preceding point is also one of the most significant presumptions of the myth criticism of the novel--the superfluity of the historical referent. History represents change and progressiveness, but these attributes are alien to the world of myth and archetypes where "sacred repetition" (Rahv 110) abounds. The historical represents the concrete and living reality of the present, which has to be negotiated in all its complexity; the myth criticism of Ulysses, however, takes refuge in nostalgia, escapism and a passive acceptance of the present. Though the "mythic method" is supposed to integrate the past with the present, the actual practice of myth criticism proves that the present is utterly divorced from the reality of a historical consciousness. Myth criticism denies history because it is afraid to face the conflict-ridden reality of the present situation of the world of the novel. Hence it remains rooted in the "eternal past of ritual" (Rahv 114), and by thus rejecting history, emerges as a backward looking activity beset by an obsession with recurrence, as opposed to the confrontation with the historical event that occurs only once. The dehistoricized world of the novel is presented as static, immobile and unchanging, bound as it is to its archetypal roots in myth. The dialectics of the historical process, the nuances of the socio-political and economic undercurrents are completely ignored, and a romantic association with archetypes renders the novel a reified entity having no roots in the present. The myth criticism of Ulysses as it is practised is completely severed from
the application of Frazerian or Jungian concepts to the historical referent in the novel which has thus been summarily dismissed.

In *Ulysses*, however, the historical component is not only unavoidable, it is also the most essential part of the novel. No reader of *Ulysses* can hope to circumvent this. Instead, as Joyce’s “mythic method” is based on this reality, every reader has to seriously negotiate this fact before attempting to analyze Joyce’s method or strategy. Though it is true that Joyce does not treat historical details in the traditional comprehensive manner, the historical referent is the very basis of the infrastructure. When the myth criticism of the novel analyzes Stephen and Bloom as members of the archetypal family, it misses the crucial fact that though both are “not significant in formal history,” they are “extremely important carriers of true meanings and genuine affections in ‘felt history’” (M Brown viii). Both the significant and the insignificant are equally important for Joyce, who chronicles the Great Famine, the Fenian and Home Rule episodes, the sensational jail rescues of the Fenians, the Phoenix Park murders, the agrarian abuses, mass evictions, and the imperialism of the Catholic Church along with the story of Stephen and the Blooms. The economic and political events of the day which absorbed his attention, find such a patent expression in his novel that one feels that he was “without rival in his mastery of its taste and flavor, its ‘felt history’” (M Brown 17). For Joyce rejects outright Yeats’ glorification of the peasantry, finding it more realistic to show forth the brutalizing poverty of this faceless humanity that earned his disgust rather than his sympathy. His response to the British and their complacent handling of “the Irish problem” was to openly expose the “contemptuous cliché of the ‘stage Irishman,’ of Paddy with his shillelagh, his jug of poteen, and a pig in the parlour” (M Brown 36).
One of the results of colonialism, says Eagleton, is that the "history of an oppressed people dwindles to a reflex of the history of their rulers," so much so, that he calls the "mythological imagination of Ireland ... a markedly historical phenomenon" (53-54). If it is true that the "Irish imagination’ broods typically upon great cyclical recurrences and eternal returns" (Eagleton 53), evidently Joyce sets out to expose this typical mythologizing habit of the Irish mind.

A crucial oversight that characterizes the myth criticism of the novel is the abstraction of concepts from their roots in anthropology and psychology. It is common knowledge that myth forms an integral part of the socio-economic and cultural life of the primitive societies it originates in, and is the very backbone of these societies whose existence depends on the myths they believe in, and the rituals they practise. The world of myths is vitally interconnected with the material, daily needs of these communities. Likewise, the archetypes have their origin in the real world. They emanate from patients’ dreams and form a reality of their own, and expressing as they do the mysterious workings of the psyche, provide a fund of material to the psychoanalyst. They are rooted in the objective world of man and matter, his conflicts and tensions, and his failure and success in their resolution. Whereas myth criticism should explore these concepts in the context of the individual disciplines they are borrowed from, it uproots them from their actual context, abstracts and absolutizes them, and then analyzes their use in Ulysses.

So the concept of Stephen as the priest-king, or the ego or spiritual man in search of carnality is divorced from its context in the actual reality of Irish history, and studied in singular isolation. What was real and alive in the context it originated in is now arbitrarily separated from that context with the sole intention of applying it mechanically
to the new context. Its meaningfulness is eroded as it is rigorously applied to the literary text, and its efficacy judged according to its degree of correspondence with it. Its variegated function in the new context does not receive any consideration from the myth critics, who are more determined to see parallels between the archetypes and their literary representations. If the original function of myth is to integrate the different aspects of reality which make up the fabric of the primitive societies, and it stands to reason that past and present merge in the contemporary use of myth, it is mandatory that its use in literature should show forth the same interrelationship between the concepts used and their concrete matrix. To propose a "mythic method" that sidesteps the historical reality of Ireland, therefore, goes contrary to the nature of myth and its origins.

Another significant omission that is related to the previous one, and characterizes the myth criticism of the novel, is the misunderstanding of its sources in anthropology and psychology. For instance, Frazer is categorical in his assertion that his theories on myth and ritual were only "provisional hypotheses," which were to be held very "loosely" in anticipation of "fresh evidence" that may call for modification or even rejection of the original hypotheses altogether (qtd. in Hyman 204). Though myth critics may insist that Joyce's "mythic method" is a "loose" application of concepts from anthropology (Vickery, L1 384), their practice does not reveal the flexibility of Frazer's thinking. While Frazer respects his data and submits himself to it accordingly, the myth critics do not give the same credence to the evidence displayed in Joyce's novel and instead, impose their own suggestions and interpretations on it, irrespective of whether their revelations have any bearing on what it actually says. Their dogmatic stand is reflected in the equally definitive conclusions they draw borrowing concepts from
anthropology, oblivious of the fact that Frazer himself preferred to state that his conclusions were tentative. Frazer's critics have accused him of "wrenching traits out of their cultural contexts" (Hyman 212), but considering his claim that he always kept the geographical and physical location as well as the "general social condition" of the chief tribes in mind (qtd. in Hyman 212) --a fact that has received enthusiastic endorsement from Malinowski in his appreciation of Frazer²--the charge is not quite valid. Sadly enough, the myth criticism of Ulysses does not reflect this truth.

Frazer may be accused of ethnocentrism, and of practising armchair anthropology, but as a fellow-anthropologist of Malinowski's stature admits, his research at Cambridge was definitely an essential guide for field workers (Hyman 228-31). And though Malinowski claims that Frazer is not an "analytic thinker," he praises his impressive collection of facts and says that Frazer has the "true scientist's intuitive discrimination between what is relevant and what is adventitious, what fundamental and what secondary" (184) and presents his facts in "real perspective within their relevant context, alive and palpitating with human desires, beliefs, and interests" (185). Frazer, he says, is thus "supremely contextual" (189), and at the same time achieves "a real synthesis from scattered and unrelated ethnographic evidence" (191). We can hardly vouch for the same about the practice of myth criticism itself, which is rarely discriminatory regarding the relevant and the irrelevant. In fact, it ignores the fundamentals of the relationship between the concepts from anthropology and the historical referent in which they are supposed to be embedded and instead, accentuates those aspects which it chooses to assume are important. Anthropological archetypes such as the priest-king and the scapegoat, and the rituals related to them are arbitrarily applied with no thought given to
their actual relevance. Being thus "supremely" ahistorical, such an application succeeds in distancing the facts from their context, and presents a distorted analysis of Joyce's work.

Jung's findings in analytical psychology also comprise a significant resource available to the myth critic, who is ever on the lookout for concepts from greener pastures to be applied to literary texts. While supporters of the Jungian theory like Young-Eisendrath and Dawson believe it is a "lively, questioning, pluralist, and continually evolving development within psychoanalysis" (xiii), the practitioners of Jungian criticism reveal little indication of this Jungian strength in their analyses. Though Jung himself quotes William James to emphasize that his theories are merely "instruments, not answers to enigmas" (4: 86), critics with Jungian affiliations have chosen to ignore this important qualification. They have likewise discarded his statement that these archetypes are prone to receiving individual inflections in the dreams and fantasies of his patients. Translated into critical practice, this means that they should take cognizance of the divergences from the Jungian theory offered by the literary text rather than identify perfunctory correspondences. Jung himself allows his theory to be moulded by the data provided by his patients' dreams; he neither has preconceptions, nor does he impose his theory onto their dreams (Dawson 255-56). As Terence Dawson expresses it, Jungian criticism should be prepared to accept the individuality of the text and the "unexpected possibility" (256) it tends to raise. Hence, he argues, it should not approach the text merely to "establish its governing archetypal image or pattern" (261).

Myth critics have, however, held the close parallelism with Jungian concepts to be sacrosanct and authentic. They have their own hidden agendas, and begin their analyses
with chosen presumptions, which they apply to the text with a flourish and a finality that is belied by the tentative nature of Jung's conclusions. In practice, the Jungian criticism of *Ulysses* prefers to begin with assumptions not warranted by the novel, where it refuses to see that Joyce does not reproduce but inverts the traditional notion of archetypes.

Since it is the particular historical component that defines the function of the archetypes in the novel, the psychological implications of the text can be arrived at only through approximation, not by airtight solutions which 'fit.' The stereotyped ideas of the archetypal family of Stephen, Bloom and Molly, the spirituality-carnality-fertility theme, and Stephen's individuation and growth as an artist, are explored in great detail and inventiveness, but not much authenticity. Whether the text supports such readings is irrelevant for these zealous critics, who are more interested in locating instances when the text meets the requirements of their criteria for the application of the Jungian concepts of the shadow and the anima.

It is held against Jung that he proposes the universal application of the archetypes he discovered, even though they originate from the particular contexts in the dreams of his patients (Gras 483). "Mythemes and archetypes reverberate in the given conventions of a particular culture, not as harmonies of a universal mind," says Gras (483), but Jung posits them as universal. It is also alleged that Jungian criticism does not bother about the social and cultural context of the literature it deals with (Boewe 193). However, Jung's own review of *Ulysses* is marked by an awareness of the Zeitgeist which had produced the book, though the same cannot be said of his followers who, in their application of Jungian theory, often neglect to take into account the referential context which informs the archetypes that are used in the novel. That Jung never intended his
concepts to be "proven entities," only "auxiliary 'tools' " (Dawson 256), is a fact often forgotten by his disciples who tend to indulge in an indiscriminate application of concepts from analytical psychology without considering the particular socio-economic set-up of the novel concerned.

Though it is convenient to demarcate among the myth critics according to the different schools of thought they subscribe to, one would have to find a place for Frye, who exemplifies the 'borrowing' principle of the myth critics in his own way. Appreciated as a great scholar, Frye's literary criticism does not find such ready acceptance, however. For Frye borrows freely from anthropology and psychology, and makes liberal use of the concepts from these disciplines in a literary criticism that he claims is 'scientific.' This, in turn, has indirectly fostered a critical practice that meanders away from what his theory professes. Schroeter feels that Frye presents "the literary cosmos [as] orderly, permanent, totally intelligible ... [and] grounds his vision in an extreme denial of historicity and process" (553). Frye's theory, however, at least acknowledges the presence of an external reality and the fact that the world of fiction cannot be totally divorced from the objective world. However, the same cannot be admitted of many other critics, who, soon after, chose to highlight the linguistic component alone, and threw out the very concept of external reality and its delineation from the novel.

Frye's own practice of myth criticism in relation to Ulysses does not take into account the historical referent which is so graphically depicted in Joyce. Though he freely exploits Jung's theory of the collective unconscious, unlike Jung, he does not acknowledge the individual inflections that the archetypes can take. Frye sees Ulysses as
belonging to the genre of the prose epic with the quest-myth as its central structure; he implies that beyond this all-important structural discovery, there is nothing more to the novel. Others, predictably, carry it to extremes by overlooking this obvious contradiction in Frye, and reducing the entire novel to a formal construction of words. Such an interpretation only results in further depletion of common sense from the procedure of myth criticism because the results of such investigations by lesser critics tend to lean towards the bizarre rather than the insightful. Myth criticism practised in this manner presents the text as a reified object, completely detached from its roots in the world of events, happenings and facts. This is certainly no way of restoring Order--it only leads to more chaos in reading and critical interpretation.

The myth criticism of Ulysses then, more often than not, misses the mark because it neglects to take the factor of Irish history into consideration. The Homeric analogy has most commonly been discussed as the specific illustration of the “mythical method,” but its ready availability to the reader does not automatically signify its ultimate importance. Joyce's use of the Homeric myth is not the area of concern of the myth critics using the Frazerian, Jungian or Frygian frameworks, though it is a commonplace to regard the Homeric parallel as a scaffolding provided to keep the otherwise unwieldy monumental work in order. Once again, it is the imminent need to superimpose order that predominates, prompting critics to consider myth the “ultimate organizing device” (Meisel 144), or a handy aesthetic tool in the service of art. The quest for order is one of the modernist themes that is commonly picked upon, where myth is used as an “arbitrary means of ordering art” and not as a “subject for interpretation” (Beebe 175) as it was used earlier. Stephen's struggle for order thus became representative of the twentieth
century struggle for a "viable mode of psychic order" (Vickery, *ML* x). So the archetypal family of Stephen-Bloom-Molly is proposed as the perfect orderly answer to the conflictual individual paths of its members as they constantly seek to be united with each other in order to achieve self-realization and fulfilment. Research in anthropology and psychology only redirected the attention of literary critics to other sources of this Order that could be manipulated. Delving deep into sources in anthropology for concepts derived from Frazer's study of the primitive communities, and into analytical psychology for dream symbols that represented archetypal figures, myth critics now had fresh fodder to feed and chew on.

In the present scene of Joyce criticism, myth criticism occupies a prominent place more for its sensationalism than for any commonsensical contribution to the corpus of Joyce studies. In fact, this offshoot of critical interpretation of the novel is characterized by outlandish statements and analyses that do not do justice to what Joyce was attempting in the novel. Joyce's "mythical method" yokes the past with the present, but not as a gesture of apology to a glorious and eternal past where nostalgia often takes us. Instead, it confronts the past in the light of the present and returns to it from the latter's point of view. It engages itself actively with the realities of the present and does not escape into some past model of eternity as the myth critics would have us believe. The ideologues of myth do not understand this demarcation between the literary use of concepts and their source value, and continue to propose readings that repeatedly valorize the elusive Order that the modern world is seeking. Joyce deliberately sets out to derromanticize the structure of the quest-myth by relating it consistently to the realities of Irish history. In this "thick and solid sensuous world" in which Bloom and Stephen fail properly to come
together, we feel that the mythic correspondences ridicule Bloom's and Stephen's quests" (Edwards 118). The myth criticism of *Ulysses* reflects the general trend of perceiving the Quest as the archetypal pattern for Order, whether it applies Frazerian, Jungian or Frygian concepts from their individual backgrounds, thereby reducing everything in the novel to this final conception of Order. The Joycean voice is subsumed within the universal voice of myth "in which the age speaks to itself" (Righter 106) in this eternal pattern of recurrence. The myth criticism of *Ulysses* thus, remains immersed in the very cyclicity that it is seeking to study in Joyce's use of myth.

This analysis of the background of the myth criticism of the novel provides the parameters for this study. The field is, of course, vast and the concepts that can be studied are many, but I have deliberately restricted myself to a selective use of certain concepts from Frazer, Jung, and Frye, and applied them to the novel. It has not been possible, therefore, to undertake a very comprehensive treatment of the myth criticism of *Ulysses* by examining all its nuances and implications, both implicit and overt. I also cannot claim to have analyzed all the works of all the myth critics who have critically interpreted the novel. Instead, by attempting research on this scale, only the possibilities of a research that questions certain fixed modes of interpretation and perception have been outlined. For the Joycean text is least amenable to any sort of closure in interpretation, but within the framework of Irish reality delineated in the novel, takes on different hues and colours that bear the stamp of Joyce's iridescent imagination and vision. I was also hampered by the fact that the material available to me along these lines was quantitatively not much and so, accordingly, my conclusions are tentatively drawn in the light of these limitations of my research.
My thesis is divided into three chapters, each of them attempting a critique of the application of the concepts of Frazer, Jung, and Frye to the novel respectively. The basis for my argument is that the myth criticism of *Ulysses* practised so far does not give adequate representation to the tangible presence of Irish history and Joyce's ironical treatment of the same in the novel. The diligent application of concepts from anthropology and psychology completely ignores the historical referent, and this lacuna is left unattended to throughout the history of the myth criticism of the novel. In this study, I hope to rectify this oversight that has rendered the myth criticism of the novel unrealistic and false.

In the first chapter I critique the practice of myth critics who have used Frazerian concepts in a one-sided way, and done more damage than good to the interpretation of the novel. The two critics studied, Vickery and Carpentier, use Frazerian concepts in a slightly different manner but end up achieving similar ends. Vickery proposes his “chief anthropological pattern,” comprising the four archetypes of priest-king, scapegoat, fertility goddess and rational intellectual, of which he discusses only the first two, relating them to Stephen and Bloom respectively, in the story. Carpentier, on the other hand, uses the myth of Demeter and Persephone and their ritual worship at Eleusis by the hierophant and initiates, and relating them to Molly, Milly, Bloom and Stephen respectively, discusses the psychoanalytical relevance of ritual in the solution of complex psychological problems. Both aim at conferring “anthropological reality” on the novel, but fail to make any impact because they miss out on the insights provided by the particulars derived from Irish history. In my alternative reading of the novel, I have tried to relate and apply the Frazerian concepts of sacral regicide and the fear of the dead in
primitive societies to the novel in my attempt to show Joyce's assimilation of historical
details in the text. In this way I have tried to prove that Vickery's definition of Joyce's
"mythic method," of bringing together the ancient and the contemporary, is not valid if
the "contemporary" does not include a serious and indepth consideration of the state of
Irish affairs. I have tried to move out of the range of the traditional association of
archetypes into Joyce's radical transformation of the same through his ironical exposure
of the parallels, which lead to places which Frazerian criticism has not exactly ventured
into so far.

The next chapter focusses on the practice of Jungian criticism in relation to
_Ulysses_, where once again the subtle workings of Irish history are completely submerged
in the details of the organization of the "archetypal family," and the various routes taken
by each member to come together. Jungians interpret Stephen's development as an artist
as a process that takes place on a super spiritual plane and renders him out of touch with
the empirical world in which he actually moves, interacts and conducts himself. Jungian
criticism of the novel valorizes Stephen's quest for self-realization, and ignores the fact
that Stephen is a product of the very history that generates the archetypes that he
confronts. In my alternative reading I show how these archetypes exemplify Stephen's
complex relationship not only with his mother, but also with his country and Church, a
fact completely overlooked by Jungians. Though the phenomena of the "nightmare" of
Irish history filter into the novel through the consciousness, the memories of the
characters, and the conversation that is carried on in pubs, newspaper office, library,
school, hospital and other venues, the fact is conveniently ignored by the critics. Jungian
criticism disregards the empirical reality which Joyce bestows on these archetypes
through their intimate relationship with the contextual reality of the historical forces which brings them forth. The critics are more interested in discovering parallels between Stephen’s progress from one archetype to another, as in typical Jungian style he proceeds with his individuation, encountering the different archetypes that, allegedly, waylay him. In the process, they neglect to take into account the archetypes that are actually present in the novel.

Finally, I look at Frye’s proposal of a comprehensive coordinating principle provided by myth as the structural element of all literature, which thus includes all the individual literary works within it. Frye’s schema has no place for the specific uniqueness of each literary work that distinguishes it from the others, and so we can imagine the fate of Joyce’s *Ulysses* in his hands. He attempts a classificatory interpretation of the novel and, like the others, does not analyze the historical substructure as a necessary prelude to his investigations into the mythical content of the novel. Frye locates the “realistic centre” in the novel, but does not attribute any further significance to it, and continues to see the novel as an expression of the quest-myth that subsumes within it the birth-death-rebirth scheme. Others continue in his trail and analyze the literary work as a formal construction of linguistic combinations, having no relationship with the external reality of Ireland and its socio-political and economic milieu. In my alternative reading I have proposed that Joyce attempts to dismantle all established notions of the myth of the social contract and utopia by taking recourse to the realities of Irish history. He does this, not by circumventing what he finds inconvenient to acknowledge, but through direct engagement with these facts to expose, reveal and explode.
In the conclusion I note joyfully—that there can be no final word about this book that attempts much and achieves even more. The novel that Joyce conceived, planned and wrote after such rigorous crafting cannot be so easily analyzed to conform to a priori conceptions and theories. As against Joyce "studies," genuine studies will continue as long as there are enough readers who, like Joyce himself, confront the hard facts regarding the reality inscribed in the novel, and are ready to face the challenges of rereading the novel to discover them.

* * *
Notes

1 See Herd 72.

2 For a detailed expression of his admiration for Frazer, see Malinowski 179-221.