CHAPTER TWO

The Jungian Approach

I sincerely hope that a great psycho-analyst will study his books, which are life itself in all its richness, felt deeply and remembered with the ingenuousness of one who has felt deeply and suffered.

Italo Svevo

Joyce is reported to have made the mocking comment that psychoanalysis would do well to discuss the "mystery of the conscious" (qtd. in Budgen 320). Jung’s review of Ulysses is more well known for his disparaging remarks on the novel than for his subsequent modification of the same. The Jungian criticism of Ulysses gets its direction from the welter of Joyce’s ambiguous relationship with the discipline of psychology, Jung’s misguided response to Ulysses, and the zealous efforts of his ‘disciples’ to bridge the ‘communication gap’ by initiating a brand of criticism surpassing anything that Joyce intended or Jung discovered in Ulysses. As a result of the witch hunt for archetypes, Ulysses is interpreted variously as the “myth of creation” (Fitzpatrick 123), “the Book of the Shadow” or the story of Stephen’s so-called individuation (Kimball, “JSF” 198, 196).

In this chapter I propose to enquire into the validity of the application of some of the Jungian concepts, (strictly by ‘professional’ Jungians, not ‘amateur’) particularly the collective unconscious and the archetypes, to Ulysses which has given us a body of myth criticism along Jungian lines.
The Jungian criticism of *Ulysses* devotes much attention to the alleged nexus between Joyce and psychoanalysis. In fact, this is the starting point for its investigations into Joyce’s presentation of the archetypes in *Ulysses*. The usual point of departure is details regarding Joyce’s reading habits, his library collection (including selected copies of Freud and Jung), visits to libraries in Trieste and Zurich, his acquaintance with Jung (which came about through his daughter’s treatment by the latter) and his own pithy views on the discipline of psychoanalysis. Since these personal details have received exhaustive coverage at the hands of Jungian critics of *Ulysses*, we shall confine ourselves only to the evidence found in *Ulysses*, which confirms the presence or absence of archetypes, and their function and significance when they are present.

To begin with, a brief overview of Jung’s theoretical formulations on the collective unconscious and the archetypes may be in order to see how the loose ends and paradoxes are built into Jung’s theory, and inform his interpretation of *Ulysses*, making the enterprise susceptible to further misunderstanding on the part of his followers. We will see the yawning gulf between the scientific discipline of analytical psychology and its literary application by ‘professional’ Jungians, who, though few in number make up for it by the rigour of treatment.

A critical application of Jung’s theoretical concept of the archetypes to *Ulysses* has for its starting premise, his belief that the human psyche is a repository of archetypes. He ascribes to the psyche an “inmost mystery” and its own “peculiar structure and form” (*FA* 35; par. 187), implying that the contents of the psyche can never be completely understood by psychoanalysis. So even before any serious enquiry into the nature of the archetypes can begin, Jung disclaims any notions regarding their sanctity, asserting that
they may even have to be invented if necessary for preserving "mental, psychic
equilibrium" and "psychic hygiene" (*FA* 27; par. 173).

A part of the psyche comprises the "collective unconscious"—a term that has
become synonymous with Jung and is defined by him as a "common psychic substrate of
a suprapersonal nature which is present in everyone of us" (*FA* 4; par. 3). The collective
unconscious is an inborn and universal entity, mankind's collective experience being the
result of a limited set of fundamental primordial experiences involving man, cosmos and
God which now exist as archetypes or primordial images in the collective unconscious.
The collective unconscious as a racial memory, is therefore, merely a "potentiality" (80;
vol. 15, par. 126) and contains no blueprint of its contents—only the outline of a blueprint.
But although it is a "potentiality," it is not unlimited in nature, but comprises
"possibilities of ideas" (81; vol. 15, par. 186) that are, paradoxically, limited in scope and
range. Jung does not resolve this contradiction of the "unlimited" nature of the collective
unconscious and the limited set of primordial experiences it contains, simply adding that
these "regulative principles" (81; vol. 15, par. 126) manifest themselves in art through
figures, situations and motifs that are present in the art work.

"An archetype," says Jung, "is an irrepresentable, unconscious, pre-existent form
that seems to be part of the inherited structure of the psyche and can therefore manifest
itself spontaneously anywhere, at any time" (449; vol. 10, par. 847). The more widely
known definition of the archetype reads thus: "Archetypes are the psychic residua of
innumerable experiences of the same type" (80; vol. 15, par. 127). Being "irrepresentable"
and "unconscious," the concrete manifestation of these "innumerable" types
(or "regulative principles") as they occur in dreams, myths and fairy tales is the only
proof of their existence in the collective unconscious. These nebulous forms, however, take their specific colouring from the individual consciousness that begets them (FA 5; par.84), and have to be consciously confronted if the psychic health of the individual is to be maintained. Jung also adds that these archetypes are “bipolar and oscillate between their positive and negative meanings” (183; vol.9, pt.1, par.310) and in this form contribute to the universal significance of the art work through their persistent recurrence. So archetypes are latent, numberless, primordial images which confirm their presence by their recurrence in the collective unconscious of mankind. But paradoxically, they are also bipolar and imbued with the “specific colouring” of the individual consciousness which begets them.

As Jung himself has said that ideas that play a “considerable role” (109; vol.15, fn.1) in his work could be applied to literature, let us verify the same by beginning with Jung’s review, "Ulysses": A Monologue (109-34; vol.15). Jung’s uncomplimentary review of Joyce’s novel is an all too familiar landmark in the criticism of Ulysses as an example of the general repugnance he has for the book. He dismisses the work as exalting nothingness, claiming that even if the novel has anything to say it is senseless and irrelevant. Ulysses, says Jung, is the story of a “passive ... consciousness ... exposed without choice or check to the ... lunatic cataract of psychic and physical happenings” (109, par.163), a story that takes place on the “senseless ... irrelevant” (109; par.164) day of 16 June, 1904. Jung strips Bloom of his intense involvement with the geophysical reality of Dublin, his acute sensory prowess, his consistent alertness to the environmental data released around him and the nuances of his thought life. With the arrogance of a psychoanalyst handling an incomprehensible case, he dismisses Bloom as
a “passive consciousness” helplessly caught in the surging rush of events. Moreover, when calling it “irrelevant,” Jung obviously does not take into account the literary and biographical criticism of *Ulysses* which furnishes overwhelming evidence of Joyce’s meticulous planning for the book, his choice of the Greek character, Ulysses, the framework of the Odyssey for his story, and his deliberate innovations in narrative technique and structure. Jung is equally unaware that Joyce was using the apparently “senseless” day of 16 June, 1904 to weave a fictional reality out of the trivial incidents that usually make up the authentic material of life and acquire a momentous far-reaching significance in course of time.

Jung’s reprobation of the novel includes calling the work a “maddening defeat of intelligent reader” (113; par. 167), and a “grotesque” and profound dream (112; fn.7) characterized by a total neglect of communicable meaning, comparable to the ravings of a schizophrenic (116; par. 173). Here Jung is guilty of the same error he accuses Freud of making regarding the dream facade: “... we say that a dream has a false front only because we fail to see into it. We would do better to say that we are dealing with something like a text that is unintelligible, not because it is a facade, but simply because we cannot read it” (qtd. in Sharma 76), adding in his autobiography, “These forms of life ... have no wish to deceive our eyes, but we may deceive ourselves because our eyes are shortsighted” (qtd. in Sharma 76). But his own review is marred by the very weaknesses, including the shortsightedness, which he denounces in Freud. Even if *Ulysses* were to be the product of a schizophrenic’s ramblings, would Jung, if he were a psychoanalyst worth his salt, dismiss a patient’s ramblings as irrelevant? And if not, why does he not interpret the work in a balanced, mature manner instead of leaving it to lesser beings to make a
mockery of? Unlike a schizophrenic’s ravings, Joyce’s work offers proof of his interest in communicating with an audience (the intelligent reader). Replete as it is with clues, the act of reading *Ulysses* represents a challenge to the reader who both looks for them and uses them to interpret the text.

Joyce was more Irish than he himself thought he was and as *fili* (Ellmann, *JJ* 287) he was also interested in communicating with the people he was specially targetting through his book. What Jung dismissed as nothing but an author’s “religious, erotic, and domestic prehistory” (114; par. 169), was actually the personal context of an author shaped by the vagaries of nationalism, and imperialism in religion and politics though recorded by one living far from it. Jung’s ‘analysis’ does not succeed in unravelling the manner in which the “drab” personal “prehistory” of the author had been transmuted into art in this novel. Finally, this “infernally nugatory” book that valorizes “nothingness” (110, par. 164) is elevated to the status of a “*document humain*” (123; par. 185) by Jung who overlooks the fact that Joyce’s painstaking documentation of Dublin details cannot be regarded as a mere paean to “nothingness.” For it is exactly the ‘somethinliness’ of “nothingness” which the book exalts that makes it a unique “*document humain*” of the soul of a city and its people.

Foregrounding the general atmosphere of nihilism in the novel, Jung barely identifies its “archetypal background” (123; par. 185) as comprising Dedalus and Bloom, behind whom stand the “eternal figures of spiritual and carnal man” (123; par. 185)—a remark betraying a lack of critical acumen which we have now come to anticipate. In his anxiety to eternalize these figures, Jung is not concerned about honestly examining the unique roles played by these so-called “eternal figures” in the particular context of Irish
reality. Moreover, if the difference between Stephen and Bloom were based on the simple and stark distinction between spirituality and carnality, Joyce need not have chosen the Homeric epic to manipulate the complexity of an ancient story to express the equally complex reality of the present. Jung forgets that *Ulysses* is much more than a mere one-to-one correspondence with the Greek epic. To complete the picture he adds that "Mrs. Bloom perhaps conceals an anima entangled in worldliness" (123; vol. 15, par. 185). Probably, she has concealed it so well that Jung could not see beyond it, for he ventures no further from this noncommittal statement, leaving the field wide open to his 'disciples' to make merry.

A closer look at Jung's analysis of the archetypal aspect of the novel in the light of his theoretical formulations regarding the archetypes reveals further contradictions. Jung has said that the archetypes take their specific colouring from the individual consciousness that begets them, but his own reading of *Ulysses* betrays a lack of application of this concept. Though he himself has claimed that his theoretical concepts could be applied to literature, his review is superficial in its understanding of the significance of the archetypes, according to the specific Irish colouring that Joyce gave them. By projecting Stephen and Bloom as stereotyped representations of spirituality and carnality, Jung limits the scope of his interpretation forgetting his own contention regarding the many-sidedness and bipolar nature of the archetypes. The lives of Stephen and Bloom reflect the typical routine of the Irish bourgeoisie and any archetypal aspect attached to their lives is felt through the piquant empirical details surrounding them which Jung in his nonapplication of his theory fails to notice. For instance, Joyce's record of Stephen's unique love-hate relationship with his mother, country and Church,
and Bloom's fears regarding his own mortality and Joyce's ironical exposition of it in "Hades" are part of the reality which Jung never sees.

Jung's review stands out as an example not of genuine critical insight but of an attitudinal problem with a literary work. In a disgruntled fashion, he hits out at the novel, looking down on Joyce for being a propagandist for existentialism and applauding him at the same time for expressing the collective unconscious of the twentieth century. Leaning back on this contradiction, he has nothing substantial to offer regarding the archetypal aspect of the novel, dismissing its contribution to the book as negligible. It is remarkable how his supporters have built on this silence eloquent 'Jungian' discourses which, more often than not, miss the point.

However, one cannot help noticing that in spite of all his reservations regarding the novel, Jung's review is interspersed with some pertinent remarks, the potential of which has unfortunately been completely overlooked by the Jungians in their desire to improve upon Jung's "subjective confession" (109; fn.1) with their own versions. Moreover, it is regrettable that Jung himself does not dwell at length on these aspects of the novel much to the detriment of the Jungian criticism of the novel that followed. For Jung is able to perceive that it is a work of "unified personal will and directed intention" (116; par.173), implying his recognition of a conscious crafting and rigorous control over technique. He also states that the book achieves an "utmost objectivity of consciousness," (123; par.185) not realizing that he has contradicted himself in this respect by comparing it to a schizophrenic's ramblings which is subjectivity personified, to say the least. He lauds Joyce for his "acute power of observation," his "photographic memory for sense-perceptions" and his expression of a "sensory curiosity directed
inwards as well as outwards” (116; par. 173). Jung’s own power of observation helps him to see and acknowledge these attributes in Joyce’s technique, though he compares it to a “delirious” (116; par. 173) work which ignores the reader. He adds that *Ulysses* has a “secret purpose which lends it meaning and value” (123; par. 185) but also argues that there is no “synthesis” (118; par. 177), thus missing the point about Joyce destroying the old and the traditional for a new order, a new synthesis. Jung does not recognize that the artist’s vision sees the ‘connectedness’ of things and unifies what is disparate in life. The “meaning and value” of Joyce’s vision, therefore, lies in his expression of the significant aspects of insignificant Dublin life, the complexity of his aesthetics, his views on religion and nationalism.

Jung’s review and his theory probably have the dubious honour of providing the outline for the corpus of the Jungian criticism of *Ulysses* as it exists today. As a result, Stephen (as the archetype of spiritual man) and the realization of his shadow in Bloom (the archetype of carnal man) and Molly Bloom as the anima have become the singular focus of attention for Jungian critics even though Jung himself has claimed that what the whole book foregrounds is not this aspect but a hopeless “boredom and monotony” (128; par. 194), an expression of the collective Zeitgeist of the twentieth century. There is, of course, nothing monotonous about a work where something new is always happening at the level of language, technique and ideas but while Jung does not see this, some of the bizarre pronouncements of the Jungians (which we shall soon analyze) seem to be making up for this “monotony” by becoming increasingly esoteric.

* * *
Probably, it is in an attempt to be faithful to their source that the Jungians have derived a set of formulaic patterns, and a package of pet obsessions and themes revolving around the figures of Stephen, Bloom and Molly, the three characters, whom Jung identifies as the *dramatis personae* making up the "archetypal background" of *Ulysses*. While Joyce has presented them clearly as individual characters, and Jung too does not establish any psychic relationship between them, Jungians are chiefly interested in discovering symbolic, mythical connections they claim exist between the three. It is customary to refer to this "essential psychic triad" (Attridge 140) as the "archetypal family" (Fitzpatrick 123) or the "ego-shadow-anima configuration" (Kimball, "FEH" 30) and propose that a mysterious, inner relationship binds them together. The proposed "family" comprises a "spiritual" father, Bloom, a "creative" mother, Molly (Walcott 47), and a "foster-son," Stephen, (Fitzpatrick 125) which is "symbolically realized" (Fitzpatrick 124). With such unwarranted attention coming their way, the three main characters in the novel acquire a Jungian halo which has come to stay more as an imposition than as Joyce's intention.

Within these familiar and familial parameters is worked out another favourite theme emerging from further imposition on the text--that of Stephen's self-realization or individuation. In a novel which has many thematic strands, much of Jungian criticism recognizes the predominant central theme as Stephen's quest for artistic fulfilment.⁵ Jungian psychology supplies the basis for this interpretation founded on his theory of individuation, which may be summed up as the individual's conscious confrontation and collaboration with the archetypes, leading to their recognition and acceptance and culminating in his or her self-realization or psychic equilibrium. Jungians are, therefore,
fond of perceiving *Ulysses* as the story of Stephen’s self-realization through his “rebirth” as an artist by confronting the archetypes in his life—his dead mother and the living Molly and even Bloom thrown in for good measure. Stephen’s stunted growth as a writer is seen as a symptom of his guilt over his mother’s death supposedly brought about by his sin of disobedience, and a fresh lease of creativity is predicted for him through his union with Molly his creative muse. The Jungians are not deterred by the fact that nothing of the sort happens in the novel and even manage to colour Stephen’s casual meeting with Bloom with Jungian overtones thereby superimposing on it a significance it does not have. In an effort to outdo Jung in the game he never intended to play, Jungians claim that Stephen’s meeting with Bloom is synonymous with the ego (as an aspect of rationality) meeting the shadow (as an aspect of carnality) as the first step in the process of individuation before his encounter with the anima, which concludes with his “rebirth” as an artist.

Stephen’s encounter with the anima in the form of the mother archetype represented both by his dead mother and Molly is another overelaborated and recurrent theme in Jungian criticism. His is the womb-to-womb story wherein, says Kimball, he reportedly embarks on the most important “psychic project” (“JHM” 483) of his life—to free himself from the crippling relationship with his dead mother for the life-giving relationship promised by his union with Molly the Great Mother (Walcott 41). These phases in his maturation are seen as crucially linked with his desire for artistic productivity and are, accordingly, given a great deal of importance by the Jungians.

Stephen’s encounter with the anima is usually analyzed as having two stages (Kimball, “FEH” 32), where the first stage involves his “sacrifice” of his mother, which
in turn frees him to receive the creative energy he needs for his work. The second stage involves his symbolic union with Molly as her son and lover thus receiving new life as an artist. Jungians allege that this process is objectified in the act of breaking the chandelier in “Circe” as an indication of Stephen’s rebirth into a new creative order. Molly is projected as the mother earth, the epitome of creativity itself, and union with her promises creative resurrection for Stephen. Stephen’s mother does not belong to this archetypal family (she is soon displaced in favour of Molly), so she is not given as much importance as Molly, who is valorized as the Jungian anima with whom Stephen’s much publicised symbolic relationship is established, and around whom hinges Stephen’s story of rebirth.

Reams of critical matter have been written on Molly Bloom—a mammoth critical enterprise undertaken by the Jungians in complete disregard of the fact that Jung himself had nothing to contribute regarding her as the anima archetype. A mysterious aura is bestowed on this middle-class ordinary woman hailed as an embodiment of Goethe’s “Eternal Feminine” and the anima who exists as a “female projection of the male psyche” (Henke 234), her sexuality being the most attractive virtue in her character. Critics, therefore, interpret her role in the text as that of Stephen’s beloved whom he idolizes but never meets. Likened to Nature in fruitful capacity and productivity, Molly is alternatively seen as the perfect medium for Stephen’s creative rebirth. Sidestepping all evidence in the novel which highlights the fact that there is no direct, physical meeting with Molly, the Jungians have in fact claimed that there is a “clearly established psychological and unconscious relationship” with her (Walcott 47) leading to artistic growth for Stephen. As the living anima, as opposed to his dead mother, she is also the
“vital, creative mother figure” (Fitzpatrick 125), a critical inference which, in the final analysis implies that Molly is the so-called beloved and surrogate mother rolled into one.

Briefly summing up the Jungian themes informing the interpretation of Ulysses, we notice that they are concerned about rewriting the novel the Jungian way, locating Jungian parallelisms and correspondences that lead nowhere as far as a genuine critical and holistic assessment of the novel is concerned. The shadow and the anima archetypes and Stephen’s individuation become convenient pegs for the critics to hang their analyses on, making the entire body of Jungian criticism largely one-sided, and therefore, hardly authentic. A closer look at some of their major critical pronouncements will reveal the loopholes and limitations that become obvious only when they are examined in the light of what the text has to say.

A good point to begin would be the statement that has probably originated from Jung’s identification of the three archetypal characters in the novel and has apparently fuelled the overwhelming interest in them and their relationship with each other. As a member of this “archetypal family,” Stephen’s goal is to be united with the other members and so the assumption is clear—Stephen has to encounter these two members of the “family” as aspects of his unconscious to achieve a higher degree of artistic consciousness. Accordingly, let us look at Stephen’s meeting with Bloom to see how far the application of the Jungian concept of the archetypes is valid in this case.

Among the critics who discuss Bloom’s Jungian role at length, Walcott makes the point that Stephen develops a “new, creative consciousness” (47) after his meeting with Bloom in “Circe,” while Kimball identifies Bloom as the shadow archetype or the personal unconscious (“JSU” 196). A major Jungian critic like Sheldon Brivic has also
explored in detail the Stephen-Bloom union (5), but as he has used Jung’s concept of synchronicity to do so, his discussion falls outside the scope of my analysis. To the extent that it affects my argument, however, I have looked at this aspect, particularly as it is applied by Walcott who represents Brivic’s stand by his repetition of the same idea. We will see that both are, in effect, repeating Jung’s assertion about Stephen and Bloom being aspects of spirituality and carnality, for though deviating widely from him in their expansive theses on Bloom, their basic argument remains unchanged.

For instance, Walcott suggests that Bloom is Stephen’s “spiritual father” (47) by virtue of the experience he undergoes in “Circe,” where the baser elements in his character are exposed in the ritualistic apparatus that fills the episode. His argument is that Bloom’s descent into “animality” is a natural turn of events before he attains “spirituality” (43) posing as the Redeemer or Messiah (l/495). Stephen’s confrontation with him implies that he is now ready to attain a higher state of creative being. Apart from sounding like a distant echo of Jung, Walcott does not make any significant point about the archetypal aspect of Bloom’s character except to superimpose a relationship between the two not supported by the text or by Jung’s review of the book. Instead, his analysis completely omits any reference to the mother archetype which dominates the entire episode, and unites the two men on the basis of facile incidents like the Shakespeare image both see in the mirror (l/567), Bloom’s rescue of Stephen after he breaks the chandelier, and the appearance of Stephen who “assumes the form of Rudy” (Walcott 46) and appears before Bloom (l/609). Besides overemphasizing a meeting that never takes place except on very casual terms (for neither Bloom nor Stephen set out
to 'meet' each other deliberately). Walcott does not advance any major proposal that enlightens the reader of Ulysses about the archetypal nature of the characters.

Kimball's essay, however, grants Bloom a Jungian status by addressing him as Stephen's shadow; a representation of his personal unconscious. Kimball claims that it is necessary for Stephen to meet Bloom as the personal unconscious before meeting Molly as the anima—a another aspect of the unconscious—in order to complete the ego-shadow-anima configuration that Jung talks about ("FEH" 30). The thrust of her argument is that Stephen's individuation comprises two stages—that of meeting the shadow and then the anima which, for Joyce, culminates in the artistically productive act of writing Ulysses. Jung says that the shadow represents "the dark aspects of the personality" (8; vol.9, pt.2, par.14), containing all the "inferior traits of character and other incompatible tendencies" (285; vol.9, pt.1, par.513), and Kimball finds Bloom representing these in the novel. She exemplifies this further saying that Stephen, as the ego in whom the superior function of thinking is a dominant mental process, confronts the more "inferior function" of "feeling and sensation" ("JNU" 200) in Bloom. In other words, Kimball's statement is nothing more than a convenient take-off from the distinction made by Jung himself, calling Bloom an example of sensual man and Stephen, "mere speculation and mere mind" (114; vol.15, par.169). While it is obvious that Jung thinks highly of neither, Kimball exalts the psychic function of thinking over feeling and sensation and claims that Stephen, in whom the latter is repressed, sees its fulfillment in Bloom in whom thinking is less developed.

But Ulysses does not offer such easy conformity to Jungian concepts and is, in fact, inaccessible to anyone who is merely interested in discovering mechanical Jungian
parallels which are meaningless. Does not Joyce prove the master-disciple, thinking-feeling scheme of Jung-Kimball wrong when he introduces Bloom and Stephen as the scientific and artistic sensibilities respectively in “Ithaca” (U/683)? The book is filled with details of Bloom’s lively, magpie-like curiosity that delves into the minutest details of sensory life (including cause and effect relationships), and gathers up glittering bits of ordinary and extra-ordinary information of life around. On the other hand, Stephen’s wispy flights of fancy into abstruse profundities are treated with high-handed mockery. Joyce offers no compromise: his respect for rational thinking and the mind equals his high esteem for raw sensation and the body. If both are equally valued by Joyce, Bloom’s Jungian identity as the shadow naturally cannot carry with it the connotations of being an “inferior part of the psyche” as Kimball (“JSU” 199) has stated. Joyce does not apologize for Bloom’s sado-masochistic and megalomaniacal frenzy in Circe; he glorifies it. He thus nullifies the basic difference between Stephen and Bloom. So how does Bloom qualify to be called Stephen’s shadow?

The other archetype which is the focus of an all-consuming attention of the Jungians is the anima, the next important landmark in Stephen’s personal quest. Jungian criticism as it is represented in the writings of Kimball and Fitzpatrick, discusses the role of the mother archetype (Walcott does not mention her at all) as the first anima stage and the significance it has in Stephen’s artistic growth, a topic much exhausted and discussed threadbare.

The general trend is to examine Stephen’s growth as an artist in the light of his dead mother’s influence on his creativity which, allege critics, is a crucial factor affecting his development. Fitzpatrick says that Stephen aims to achieve objectivity in art (a
condition necessary for art) by overcoming the subjective influence of the "maternal triad... [of] May Dedalus, Ireland/Dublin and the Church" (124) in his life through the rite of initiation that is represented by the three episodes, "Oxen of the Sun," "Circe" and "Penelope" (125). As an artist he is preparing for his future by dealing with his past and its influence on him through participation in the ritual of exorcism and the detachment it brings about. The three episodes, says Fitzpatrick, form the framework for the rite of initiation by which Stephen undergoes a radical though not visible transformation (125), where he breaks free of the suffocating presence of his mother's memory and is prepared for union with the other members of the "archetypal family," particularly the anima figure of the life-giving Molly. The episodes follow a pattern involving Stephen's break with the past, his confrontation with it and then his forging a new artistic life for himself. Fitzpatrick relates Stephen's destruction of the chandelier to a significant psychic event—that of sacrificing his mother, which Jung states in so many words: "The world arises when man discovers it. He discovers it when he sacrifices the mother" (qtd. in Fitzpatrick 138). Besides omitting to furnish a detailed interpretation of the manner in which Stephen overcomes his so-called mother complex, except to say that something happens when Stephen breaks the chandelier, Fitzpatrick does not explain how the mother archetype as represented by Ireland and the Church is confronted and overcome by Stephen. So when he proposes Molly as an alternative to the mother archetype, it is debatable that she will fit the role in its multifarious aspects when his analysis of the role of the mother archetype itself remains incomplete.

Kimball discusses the mother archetype more specifically as a stage in Stephen's "psychic development," ("FEH" 30), putting forth Jung's theory that separation from the
mother is of the "greatest educational significance" (AOF 86; par.4) for the son.
Confrontation with the mother in "Circe" is essential, she says, because Stephen’s libido, i.e., his creative energy, can attain full expression only after his liberation from the obsessive maternal memory that plagues him. Jung says that for the son, "the anima is hidden in the dominating power of the mother (29; vol.9, pt.1, par.61) and to achieve independence from her, his relation with her "must cease, must die" (312; vol.5, par.473).
She too echoing Fitzpatrick, equates Stephen’s sacrifice of his mother with his rebirth as an artist and claims that the process begins in "Oxen of the Sun," where he makes up his mind to overcome her influence, and reaches its climax in "Circe" where he overthrows her presence ("JDM" 485-88). He is then reborn into new life through his union with Molly/Penelope. Kimball, thus, reproduces Fitzpatrick's argument without having contributed anything original towards Jungian criticism. Moreover, both of them focus all their attention on Stephen’s success in his encounter with his dead mother in "Circe," as symbolized by the breaking of the chandelier, but do not realize that this archetype continues to dominate the rest of the episode in its aspects of the country and the Church.
In fact, unlike Fitzpatrick who at least makes a reference to the other representations of the mother archetype, it is surprising that Kimball does not make a single reference to these important concepts in Jungian theory in what purports to be an unadulterated Jungian reading of Ulysses.

Molly Bloom represents the next stage of the anima who, commonly perceived as a symbol of fertility, has herself promoted an awe-inspiring fertility in Jungian criticism which has canonized this creation of Joyce as the Jungian anima par excellence, the whole affair having traces of a heroine-worship characterized by a Molly-can-do-no-
wrong attitude. Apparently, the role she plays in Stephen's development is so crucial that Stephen himself is overshadowed by this glare of critical attention. The archetype is not only overelaborated, it also follows the beaten track wherein most Jungians equate Molly, as an embodiment of the feminine principle, with creation. While there are no two thoughts about Molly as the anima in the novel, Jungian criticism is divided as to the exact nature of this role, thus becoming a classic example of: united we stand and divided we fall.

For instance, Walcott and Fitzpatrick see her as the life-giving mother figure (41, 125) who symbolizes creativity and is the appropriate goal for an artist in quest of his ideal of creativity. She thus becomes an objective correlative for creativity itself, as both the means to this end and the end as well. This confuses the issue to say the least as Walcott's reading of Molly is not in complete agreement with Fitzpatrick's. Walcott pitches Molly's positive presence opposite Bella Cohen's menacing one (41), claiming that Stephen's encounter with the latter (one thought it was Bloom who dominated this encounter) prepares him for a more amicable meeting with the mother figure of Molly. Since it is Stephen's mother who holds all his attention in "Circe," and has to be negotiated first, one wonders how Walcott bypasses her to arrive at Molly as the alternative mother figure. According to Walcott, Cohen represents the darker aspects of the unconscious while Molly symbolizes the creativity of consciousness (41). He asserts that there is a "psychological, unconscious, inner, symbolic meeting" (47) between Molly and Stephen and thus counterattacks the charge that the text does not support a physical, literal and conscious meeting between the two.
On the bases of Stephen's reincarnation in the text as Rudy, Bloom's son, and Molly's day-dream of serving Stephen in her Turkish red slippers (U 780), Walcott arrives at the far-fetched conclusion that Stephen is Molly's "son" and she is his new mother who ushers in new life for him as an artist. But Molly imagines him as her lover so one wonders if Walcott is retelling Jung's "sacred archetype of the marriage of mother and son," (AOF 169, par.22) where the "son is spouse and sleeping suckling rolled into one" (AOF 169, par.23). In that case, Stephen is both son and lover of the mother, but as he spurns a meeting with Molly at any level (U 695), and the text does not make explicit what is "unconscious" and "inner" or manifest any genuine meeting of psyches, how can the reader see this as anything but a gross imposition on the novel? Walcott concludes that such a meeting with Molly assures Stephen of artistic wholeness but does not solve the mystery of why Stephen must "meet" Molly or Bloom as a necessary condition to be reborn as a writer.

Fitzpatrick's position echoes Walcott's when he agrees with the latter in saying that Stephen is being groomed for his role as the foster-son to the creative mother figure of Molly; he also anticipates Kimball when he gives due importance to the mother archetype in Stephen's formation as an artist. Fitzpatrick, like Walcott, sees Rudy as an indication of the possibility of Stephen's adoption into the "archetypal family." To exalt Molly's role as Stephen's foster mother, he even quotes Jung to say that "the hero is often obliged to experience exposure, and upbringing by foster parents, and in this manner he acquires two mothers" (qtd. in Fitzpatrick 142) But isn't Stephen trying to get away from one of the mothers? However, this remark is misappropriated by Jungian criticism in general to put forth the commonplace interpretation that the story of Ulysses is the
story of Stephen’s attempts to overthrow the negative influence of his mother in favour of Molly’s positive one on his creative prowess. Fitzpatrick suggests that Stephen’s need for a surrogate mother is acute because of his guilt over his biological mother’s death but he does not analyze the significance of the latter’s role in Stephen’s so-called yearning for a substitute. When he argues that Molly symbolically supplants May Dedalus, Ireland and the Church (142), he particularizes her context, but contradicts himself when he calls her “Earth Mother” (141), thereby eternalizing her and confusing our perception of her. Obviously, he does not remember Jung’s statement that Molly conceals “an anima entangled in worldliness;” nor does he realize that it does not support his glorification of an ordinary bourgeois woman excessively interested in bodily pleasures--a view that the novel projects and Jung captures in his abstract noun.

It appears that Walcott and Fitzpatrick are together attempting to link Jung’s concept of the bipolar nature of the archetypes with the interpretation of Molly as a mother goddess and seductress, to justify the revelation of her desire to be united with Stephen as her son and lover. After her projection as the ultimate mother figure, her additional role as Stephen’s lover is difficult to understand. Not only does Stephen have nothing to do with her in the text, he is also not interested in her as a lover and so Molly’s longing to have sexual relations with him cannot be excessively emphasized without sufficient textual evidence of the actual happening.

Kimball differs from Walcott and Fitzpatrick in her interpretation of Molly as the anima representing the beloved and not the mother figure. She claims that Stephen’s artistic immortality rests with Molly and uses Jungian theory to prove her point that Molly has a crucial developmental role to play in Stephen’s individuation. Quoting Jung,
she says that the anima stands immediately behind the shadow and controls it ("FEH" 31) and that Stephen could encounter the "masterpiece" (the anima) only after he has met the "apprentice-piece" (qtd. in "JSU" 197) in the form of the shadow or Bloom. She also declares that there is a valid explanation for Stephen's failure in meeting Molly in the novel on actual terms, provided by Jung's statement that not many can bring off an encounter with the anima (qtd. in "FEH" 31). So she justifies the same in the novel on these grounds saying that Molly is presented more as a "challenge for Stephen's highly problematic future rather than as a fact of his life" ("FEH" 33). Of the four stages of the anima mentioned by Jung, the figures of Eve and Helen are highlighted by Kimball as relevant for the novel and she outlines Stephen's progress from his mother as represented by Eve, "the maternal significance of the anima" (qtd. in "FEH" 32), towards Molly, "the prime anima-figure," ("FEH" 32) as the romantic Helen who is also the more desirable and congenial anima after he has escaped from his mother.

The underpinnings of Kimball's essay are obviously to be sought in Jung's theoretical concept of the anima which she has already stated in the essay in her statement that Molly is the chosen anima because she stands behind the shadow and controls it. Jung also says that, "in every masculine mother complex, side by side with the mother archetype, a significant role is played by the image of the man's sexual counterpart, the anima" (FA 19; par. 162). But if Bloom has already been proved to be anything but Stephen's shadow it follows logically that Molly probably cannot be characterized as the anima so easily either. Any ambiguity that may be generated by the mother archetype also being regarded as the "sexual counterpart" is dealt with by Kimball when she quotes Jung as saying that the anima is always projected upon a
woman: "Every mother and every beloved is forced to become the carrier and embodiment of this omnipresent and ageless image, which corresponds to the deepest reality in a man . . . this perilous image of Woman" (13; vol.9, pt.2, par.24). In the context of the novel Molly is now his beloved and as his steps are purported to be heading towards her via Bloom, Kimball sets forth a Stephen-Bloom equation first before arriving at a Stephen-Molly meeting which she asserts takes place more in its potentiality than in actuality. An analysis of her argument may be worthwhile to judge for ourselves the validity of her statements in the light of the text.

Kimball locates three "intricately, interwoven motifs" in the novel to prove her thesis ("FEH" 33). She refers to two dreams of Stephen to identify the first motif—one of Stephen's dead mother (U 5) and the other where he dreams of Haroun al Raschid offering him a melon, inviting him into the "street of harlots" and saying "Come. Red carpet spread. You will see who" (U 47). She interprets the first dream to mean that Stephen seeks to get away from the ghoulish presence of his mother, and the second to mean that the man as Bloom incognito offers him Molly in the form of the melon (Bloom sees Molly's rump as melons in "Penelope" (U 734), an idea to be found in Walcott as well (41). Kimball adds that this idea is repeated in "Circe" when Stephen recollects this dream: "I dreamt of a watermelon" (U 571). The significant point to be noted, says Kimball, is that this is succeeded by Stephen's mother disappearing from the brothel after his encounter with her (U 583), thus freeing Stephen to desire and pursue Molly as his anima.

The second motif refers to the cloud that Stephen sees when he thinks of his mother (U 9), the same cloud being seen by Bloom (U 61) as it interrupts his daydream of
melons, the "heavy, sweet, wild perfume" of the fruit (*U* 60) reminding him of Molly who has already appeared as the creamfruit melon in Stephen's Arabian Nights dream. Stephen and Bloom are 'united' through the cloud, and thus the motif of the dreams, says Kimball, prefigures the Stephen-Molly meeting she ultimately proposes in the novel. The "motif of bondage is initially associated with the mother" ("*FEH*" 35) but "the pillar of the cloud" is associated with Molly who represents the success he supposedly experiences after he escapes from his mother. Kimball borrows freely from the biblical story of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt and uses the related symbols to illuminate Stephen's personal exodus from his mother's memory towards the freedom promised by Molly ("*FEH*" 38).

Finally, she refers to the third motif of the star, the constellation of Cassiopeia which both Bloom and Stephen gaze at from the former's garden outside Molly's bedroom. It appears first when he attempts to write something in "Proteus;" the constellation is described as the "farthest star . . . darkness shining in the brightness" (*U* 48). It signifies artistic immortality for Stephen which, along with his dreams and the cloud are associated with Molly, thus making Stephen's search conclude in her ("*FEH*" 38). So Stephen follows Bloom who guides him to Molly and to the final goal--the act of writing *Ulysses*. Molly's thoughts of him in her reverie finally unite her with Stephen (*U* 780), the transfer of affections from mother to beloved indicating that Stephen has crossed a psychological barrier and moved from the "dependency of the infantile relationship to the mutual dependence of the adult love-relationship" ("*FEH*" 35).
In many ways Kimball’s essay repeats ideas found in Fitzpatrick’s and Walcott’s writings and thus has nothing original to contribute. By uniting the three main characters in the novel—Stephen and Bloom through their common dream and Molly through her thoughts of Stephen—she echoes Fitzpatrick’s idea of the “archetypal family,” albeit through a different route, as well as that of Walcott’s. Her essay differs from theirs in that she clearly identifies Molly as Stephen’s beloved. What renders the conclusions in her essay problematic is her identification of Joyce’s use of the motifs of the dreams, the cloud, and the star to lead Stephen to Molly. In the absence of any concrete evidence in the novel that supports a meeting of Stephen and Molly, these motifs seem as flimsy as Stephen’s so-called passage to Molly bizarre. What with symbols like the pillar of cloud by day, the pillar of fire by night (signified by Molly’s bedroom light) and the star, the quester, given their traditional biblical significance, should have been led—one feels—more easily towards Mary (as an embodiment of “spiritual motherhood”) rather than to Helen!

Another point overlooked by Kimball is the fact that while Stephen does not meet Molly the anima in keeping with the Jungian condition, he does meet his mother in the initial phase of the anima stage, and seeks to vanquish her by breaking the chandelier (“FEH” 35) Apparently, he succeeds in ‘bringing it off,’ according to Kimball. If that were true, it follows that his nipped-in-the-bud meeting with Molly should have been equally successful. A closer look at his meeting with his dead mother, however, shows that he does not have any conscious encounter with her. For dead drunk as he is, he breaks the lamp-shade and runs from her presence, and because he fails to come to terms with his mother’s memory, he is incapable of negotiating the anima as represented by
Molly. In the first case he escapes, in the second, he refuses: "Promptly, inexplicably, with amicability, gratefully..." (U/695). It appears that he was offered a chance to know her but he gives it up voluntarily--probably as an attempt to evade a meeting with his anima?

In his review, Jung castigates the novel saying that Joyce describes a "destructiveness" that is an "end in itself" (116; vol.15, par.172). It is ironical, then, that the Jungians should celebrate the novel as a myth of creation and as an account of Stephen's 'coming to be.' The theory of individuation is an overarching concept which forms the veritable backbone of Jungian criticism with its interpretation of Stephen's achievement of self-realization at the end of the novel. After having "overcome" his mother-complex in "Circe," Stephen is on the threshold of achieving wholeness as an artist through union with Bloom and Molly who represent the negotiable archetypes of his unconscious. Jungian criticism generally sees this "self-realization" as Joyce's act of writing *Ulysses*. Stephen's 'coming to be' is equated with the novel's 'coming to be' (Fitzpatrick 143) in the finished form of *Ulysses*, narrating, in other words, the myth of creation or the story of the artist's language finally coming to fruition. The general assumption is that Stephen has touched the low point of creativity and needs to achieve psychic equilibrium and "increasing self-awareness" before he can create (Fitzpatrick 124). His future at the end of the novel is supposed to contain the potentiality for his artistic evolution. Fitzpatrick further suggests that Stephen the would-be artist attempts to break free from the fetters of a dead language fossilized by convention and hampered by a dearth of imagination. The "Oxen of the Sun" episode is indicative of this while "Circe" offers the therapy of purgation to help the artist shed personal encumbrances to
achieve the impersonality and detachment necessary for the artist's vision. This finally gets a new life as represented in "Penelope," which "constitutes the malleable, life giving substance which is the foundation of all art" (Fitzpatrick 127). Kimball adds that Stephen wishes to be immortalized through the act of writing *Ulysses* for only art can survive the artist and secure immortality for him ("FEH" 37).

All of them miss the crucial point that Stephen is not a hero except to himself. He does not, for he cannot mature, in the course of a single day--16 June 1904. One just has to read his "poems" to see how undistinguished he was as a poet. "Proteus" provides an initial sampling of his writing when Stephen composes his love poem (*U* 48) which is fully quoted in "Aeolus." The gypsy love song has just been quoted inspired as it is by Stephen's recollection of the ambience of the tanyard and its smells. The latter pulsates with the sensuousness of life and raw emotions, "*White thy fambles, red thy gan And thy quarrons dainty is. Couch a hogshead with me then. In the darkmans clip and kiss*" (*U* 47). Stephen's own lines in stark contrast, are lifeless: "*On swift sail flaming From storm and south He comes pale vampire, Mouth to my mouth*" (*U* 132). Both the poems are talking about a kiss being exchanged, but the passionate kiss of the gypsies is reduced to a barren act in Stephen's version. His lines contain no 'poetry' to qualify for a poem. The deliberate juxtaposition of the two is the result of Joycean intervention where the reader is invited, in a sense, to compare the two and draw conclusions.

Joyce himself says nothing about Stephen's ability. The irony lies in the fact that Stephen does not notice the difference while Joyce does. Joyce, the older self, has arrived at that point where he looks at his younger self and enjoys the difference, and so he is mature. The book is a record of his perceptions of the younger self--it does not
explain how Joyce reached that stage, working out his salvation with tears. Joyce makes up for the indirection of his youth by writing *Ulysses,* thus improving on his immature self. Quite obviously, the process of writing *Ulysses* did not take place in one day, as neither did Joyce’s maturation as an artist. Joyce’s presentation of Stephen proves that Joyce has matured. Jungian criticism inevitably obscures this in its efforts to project Stephen’s maturation as if he had a separate identity from Joyce when in actuality Stephen is the characterization of the young, immature Joyce, trying to find his feet as an artist.

According to Jungian criticism, ritual plays an important part in Stephen’s rebirth as an artist. His negotiation with his past and his decision to confront it in order to uproot its malignant influence on his life and create a new future for himself are, it is believed, best signified by a ritual. Jungian criticism invariably identifies Stephen’s act of breaking the chandelier as a ritualistic act of freeing himself from a past dominated by maternal memory and cites this as a moment of rebirth for the artist who is now set free to create after the transformation that has been effected in his personality. Fitzpatrick quotes Eliade as saying that the basic idea behind ritual is that “to attain a higher mode of existence, gestation and birth must be repeated; but they are repeated ritually, symbolically” (125). He argues that the act of breaking the chandelier is succeeded by the pertinent information immediately provided in the text that Stephen was born on a Thursday which was “Today” (*U* 562). Stephen’s rebirth is now indicated by the more elaborate ritual of the Black Mass (*U* 599), which in repudiation of institutionalized religion, is an inversion of the fertility rite (Fitzpatrick 139). Through participation in Mass, the believer is reborn by reentering his mother’s womb, which according to Jung,
is symbolized by the Church (Fitzpatrick 139). The latter supplies the ritual that objectifies an inner psychological change. He also projects Rudy’s appearance at the end of “Circe” as an indication of Bloom’s adoption of Stephen into the “archetypal family.”

But Fitzpatrick’s main thesis is that the framework for the rite of initiation is provided by the three episodes, “Oxen of the Sun,” “Circe” and “Penelope.” They apparently give a succinct account of Stephen’s birth as an artist by his rejection of the biological mother (U 390), his break with the past in “Circe” symbolized by the rituals performed therein, and the resulting rebirth leading to personal rejuvenation for the artist through the realization of his artistic ideal as symbolized by Molly. Kimball treats the idea of Stephen’s rebirth more sketchily in comparison saying that to escape the guilt associated with his mother’s death, Stephen flees from the vengeful spectre she has now become and, therefore, “sacrifices” his mother to be reborn. She quotes Jung as saying that the separation from the mother imago is equated with “the birth out of one’s self” (“JIDM” 490) and connects textual hints like Thursday being Stephen’s birthday with the foetal position of his body at the end of “Circe,” (U 609). She then argues in favour of Stephen’s future, which though “highly problematic,” is bright with the promise of liberation from his mother’s presence once and for all (“JIDM” 490).

The significant critical issue here is the relationship of Stephen’s individuation with ritual. The latter is obviously the vehicle Stephen uses to outgrow his immature self. However, an important oversight made by Jungian criticism in general comes to light at this point. Jung says that the “decisive factor is always consciousness, which can understand the manifestations of the unconscious and take up a position toward them” (MDR 187). In the process of individuation, therefore, the consciousness of the subject
plays a pivotal role in encountering the unconscious and understanding it. Applying this theory to the text we observe that Stephen is anything but conscious when encountering the mother archetype—he is inebriated and in a drunken stupor throughout the ritual of 'vanquishing' his mother and even after. Till he is knocked down by the watch and rendered literally unconscious (U 601), he remains dead drunk even when going through the most significant moments of his much publicized rebirth. At no stage has he actively and consciously participated in the ritual of rebirth—the most crucial event of his life.

The entire argument of Stephen's rebirth and subsequent self-realization becomes suspect if examined in the light of this textual evidence. Joyce has quite clearly outplayed the Jungians at their own game.

Having looked at some of the limitations of Jungian criticism as it has been practised so far, we can say that it is characterized by a paucity of imagination and an inability for a holistic understanding of the Jungian theory. Much of it is a repetition of well-worn ideas, making the body of Jungian criticism stereotyped and mechanical. Obvious themes like the mother's dominating influence and Molly as a symbol of creativity are made much of though they do very little to enhance our understanding of the novel. Joyce's variegated use of the archetypes and their creative function in the text are not the focus of the attention of Jungian criticism by and large, with the result that the criticism of the novel along Jungian lines suffers from a number of defects, the least among them being a mechanical application of Jungian theory, repetitiveness of ideas, and a restrictive interpretation of the function of the archetypes in the text. I hope to substantiate these comments with an alternative Jungian interpretation of the text and advance my argument with suitable illustrations from the novel. We will see that Joyce's
use of the archetypes is uniquely guided by the particularity of the context that dictates the story of *Ulysses* and does not bow to the demands of Jungian theory in any comfortable conformity.

* * *

We begin with Kimball who, basing herself on Jung, says that the "confrontation and acknowledgement of the shadow . . . is an essential prerequisite to any conscious encounter with the anima . . ." ("FEH" 30). This is supposed to be the first stage in the process of individuation. But a close reading of the novel informs us differently. It shows us that much before Stephen's meeting with the shadow, he meets the collective unconscious itself through the symbol of water (sea) in the first page of the book. Water is, according to Jung, "the commonest symbol for the unconscious" (18; vol.9, pt.1. par.40), to which Kimball makes a passing reference ("FEH" 34). Jung also adds that a meeting with the shadow ("narrow door") (21; vol.9, pt.1, par.45) leads to the water (the collective unconscious). But in *Ulysses*, Joyce typically reverses this Jungian formula, bringing to nought all serious Jungian interpretations: he makes Stephen meet the water before he meets the shadow! And if the shadow is a personification of the "dark aspect of the personality," we will see how the sea functions as an even darker aspect of the same in *Ulysses*. For the sea has a dual role to play both as a symbol of the collective unconscious and the mother archetype, (Jung, *FA* 15; par.157) which brings us to another point: Stephen meets the sea--"great sweet mother" (*U* 5) --in the form of a symbol of the mother archetype before he meets his personal unconscious. Stephen, therefore, encounters the anima (as mother) much before he meets the personal
unconscious or shadow, (as Bloom), thus reversing the usual Jungian process of meeting
the anima after meeting the personal unconscious.

A quick look at the motif of the sea and the difference in its impact on Stephen
and Bloom will give us an idea of how Joyce has shaped the articulation of this universal
archetype. He allows their individual personalities to colour it according to their thought
processes and particular experiences—a crucial point in Jung’s theory of the archetypes.
In Stephen’s case, the motif of the sea is established as a setting in its dominating aspect
in the opening episode where he and Buck Mulligan commune with it opposite the
Martello Tower. The association of the sea with the “great, sweet mother” and with the
memory of the bowl containing the “green sluggish bile” (U/5) she throws up during her
illness signifies for Stephen the secrets of the collective unconscious too unbearable to
endure— it represents the mother archetype and the impact it continues to have on his
psyche.

Continuing his ruminations by the sea-side in “Proteus,” his poetic imagination
supplies him with a visual reproduction of an ancestral experience where invading power
and might conflict with national deprivation and want. “Galleys of the Lochlanns . . . I
spoke to no-one: none to me” (U/45). He confronts the racial inheritance of the Irish—
“Famine, plague and slaughters . . . ”—a collective experience of which the fall-out is the
mass attack on the “green blubbery whalemeat” (representing Ireland)—a problem
endemic to a nation and a race to which Stephen too belongs. With his fellow-men he
still shares the collective memory of the eventful turns in the history of their country—the
numerous invasions by Danish Vikings and Norman knights, and the Great famine of
1845-48 (Hodgart 18, 14). Today Stephen has inherited this ‘racial memory’ filtered through journalistic reportage, archival history, city gossip, and nostalgia.

Joyce also exploits Stephen’s physical fear of water to symbolize his fear of the collective unconscious and the power it will unleash as the unknown, unseen element of the psyche—a fact missed out by the Jungians again. Water too, like the unconscious, has the ability to contain secrets, e.g., the body of the unidentified drowned man. Stephen’s hydrophobia has its origins in an infantile horror of the unseen and its qualities as he perceived it: “Water cold soft. When I put my face into it in the basin at Clongowes. Can’t see! Who’s behind me? Out quickly, quickly!” (U/45). Coupled with his natural fear, is the psychological dread of being submerged in the unplumbed depths of the unconscious.

On the other hand, Bloom’s encounter with the water (sea) as a symbol for the collective unconscious is vastly different from Stephen’s. Bloom loves the ‘livingness’ of water not its ‘deadness’ as it is clearly revealed here. In “Calypso,” he recollects the Dead Sea: “Vulcanic lake, the dead sea . . . It lay there now. Now it could bear no more” (U/61). While agreeing with Ellmann that Joyce “deflates Zionism” here (UOF 36), the recollection of the Dead Sea in Palestine, instigates in Bloom a racial memory that brings forth the horrifying picture of the Jewish diaspora—the first race and its history of persecution, suffering and near-annihilation. It awakens in him the painful realization of the death of a nation, a people, a race to which he too belongs. Today it was dead, its erstwhile fruitfulness reduced to barrenness, the “poisonous foggy waters” (U/61) of the present day Zion reminiscent of the “snotgreen sea” (U/5) of Ireland and its equally unbearable reality of a “dead sea in a dead land” (U/61). For the sensuous, life-loving
Bloom, who has lost his son, this is a reminder too hard to bear, his horror-filled reaction to the images of his collective unconscious leaving him almost lifeless himself. Urgently wishing to renew contact with life and light, he is relieved to feel the light of his consciousness beckoning to him: "Quick, warm sunlight came running from Berkeley Road... along the brightening footpath... she runs to meet me, a girl with gold hair on the wind" (U 61), putting him in touch with the present warmth of life. Imaged as a young girl (his daughter Milly perhaps, or a nostalgic recollection of a young Molly) she represents the bright hope of the future--an idea reinforced by his vision of Rudy later in the story.

Joyce expresses the essential difference between Stephen and Bloom imagistically and finally in "Ithaca" where Bloom the waterlover can afford to admire water for the diversity of its power and attraction while Stephen who detests it, prefers to remain a hydrophobe, hating partial or total contact with it in any form (U 673). Bloom loves its "universality... democratic equality... unplumbed profundity... variability... violence in seaquakes... secrecy in springs... its buoyancy in the waters of the Dead Sea" including even the "noxiousness of its effluvia..." (U 671-72). Bloom is, by nature, intuitively unafraid of the unconscious, while Stephen shies away from the "aquacities of thought and language" (U 673)--the shifting truths which water symbolized for him.

While Jungian theory also mentions that the archetypes are bipolar, characterized by an "extraordinary many-sidedness" (AOF 50; par.339), Jungian criticism often ignores this important qualifier. It restricts its interpretation of Ulysses to a discussion of isolated archetypes like the anima without going into the finer nuances which Jung's concept of
the archetypes makes allowances for. In the process, it ignores Joyce’s creative handling
of the theme of the novel to which he necessarily expects his readers to respond. For
instance, Jung says that the anima as the mother archetype has an “infinite variety of
aspects” (FA 15; par. 156) which, broadly speaking, may be divided into figures from the
immediate family, like the mother and grandmother, and figuratively speaking, into
goddesses and devotion inspiring objects like Church, university, city, country (FA 15;
par. 156). All these aspects are conflated in Jung’s statement that as consciousness
develops, the mother archetype diminishes in power and “all the mysterious qualities
attaching to her image begin to fall away and are transferred to the person closest to her,
for instance the grandmother” who is often a witch as well as wise (FA 36; par. 188). A
further elevation of this archetype to that of the Great Mother splits into opposites of the
“good fairy” and the “wicked fairy” (FA 36; par. 189). We will see that during the
progression from the first stage of the anima to the second, Joyce peoples the book with a
whole set of variations on the mother archetype which Jungian criticism in general has
not taken into account.

Most Jungian critics are silent about the role of the milkwoman and her later
transformation into the Gummy Granny of “Circe.” Critical appraisals of the novel have
dwelt at length on the dual aspects of the mother as loving and terrible (Kimball, “JDM”
477-90), and the more sinister aspect of the anima represented by Bella Cohen (Walcott
41) as opposed to the beneficent Molly. But the significance of the milkwoman as a
manifestation of the mother archetype representing the country and the Church has been
overlooked by all.
The old witch makes a dramatic if silent entrance in *Ulysses*. Even before her arrival she is already anticipated by Mulligan’s demand for milk, and the obscenities he starts revelling in. His pejorative reproduction of the conversation between Mrs. Cahill and old mother Grogan regarding the latter making water and tea in the same pot is Joycean imagery for a corrupt and polluted Ireland (*U* 12). Mother Grogan’s reappearance in “Circe,” to oppose Bloom’s reforms for a truly free Ireland is significantly preceded by Lenehan’s proposal for “mixed bathing” (*U* 490). After receiving an injunction from Mrs. Cahill in “Telemachus” (*U* 12) not to mix the water she makes with tea in the same pot, she literally opposes anything ‘mixed,’ including mixed races, mixed marriage and mixed bathing. As a probable early representative of the mother archetype, she represents a conservative and intolerant Ireland that finds any reform movement an anathema. Mulligan continues with a vulgar joke about Mary Ann, supplementing the effect already created:

For old Mary Ann

She doesn’t care a damn

But, hising up her petticoats ... (*U* 13 )

Old age, particularly old women, are being targetted--an indication of Ireland being made a butt of crude jokes by one of her own people who will turn out to be a “gay betrayer” (*U* 14).

Into this atmosphere of ribald conversation in the kitchen, the old milkwoman steps: “The doorway was darkened by an entering form” (*U* 13). The darkening effect her appearance projects, indicates her secretive aspect, a figure shrouded in mystery like
the daybreak that is yet to unfold the morning’s secrets. In the darkened form of her
figure, Stephen also confronts the darkness of his unconscious in the symbolic
representation of his country. She is the repository of the Irish past, a custodian of her
values, conventions and traditions. “He watched her pour into the measure . . . To serve
or to upbraid, whether he could not tell: but scorned to beg her favour” (U 13-14).
Milkless herself, she represents the present sterility of her country, Ireland, which was
also old and unproductive. Coming from a “morning world,” the old witch comes in
from the world of dawn, a time closest to the disappearing night, a time that is the most
mysterious aspect of the diurnal pattern of nature.

As a citizen from the hoary past, the old milkwoman, being close to mother earth
and all her bounty, is literally a witch with her esoteric lore (Celtic mythology) and
wisdom. But now as a “wandering crone” (U 14), she represents the historical break with
the past. Where Ireland was once free and prosperous, she was now a miserable vassal,
having no identity of her own, except as a servant of the Empire and of the Irish leaders
who have dominated her politics and betrayed her national interests to the imperial
power. Irish culture and tradition, with its ancient undiscovered potential untapped, has
grown old with age, become a “server of a servant” (U 11) as its own poet and national,
Stephen, was. Stephen dislikes the replica of himself he sees in her. His own version of
a tired creativity is synonymous with the dead Irish culture and literary life. Her image
too, seen through the “cracked looking glass of a servant” (U 16), is distorted by the
experiences that have disfigured her, showing forth the devastation of a country whose
contours have changed in all the spheres. The serenity of the pastoral vignette of lush
fields and dew silky cows takes on menacing dimensions when her present role as
"wandering crone" and "common cuckquean" (U 14) signifies the drastic change in the status of Ireland. Rather than condemn her (Ireland) or ask her favour, he prefers personal exile in another country.

He is scornful when she bows her old head obsequiously: "to a voice that speaks to her loudly, her bonesetter, her medicineman; me she slights. To the voice that will shrive and oil for the grave all there is of her but her woman's unclean loins, of man's flesh made not in God's likeness, the serpent's prey. And to the loud voice that now bids her be silent with wondering unsteady eyes" (U 14). Ireland slights her artists, her intellectuals and her thinkers. He wants to slight her in retaliation, hence his demeaning thoughts about her. He can see that she is destined for the grave. In primitive times, the medicineman as shaman or magician recited spells and chants to set right a wide range of grievances pertaining to the tribe's cultural, social and economic life. Today's "medicineman," Buck Mulligan, cannot promise to set right the crooked times easily, nor does the old woman as witch contain any formula for the ailing Ireland. Though Stephen had already embarked on the self-induced mission of forging the conscience of his race (Ellmann, C 75), Ireland does not believe that artistic imagination can set right the malady. She scorns the intellectual imagination as an instrument of liberation, preferring the treatment meted out by nationalist betrayers who, while pretending to diagnose her illness and heal her, are preparing her for the grave with their short-sighted policies. His country is the serpent's prey; inferior being that she is, she succumbs to temptation and serves the voices of imperialism and petty nationalism, having forgotten the Irish tradition and culture.
Another powerful image of the anima as old woman is the Church to whom Stephen cannot pay the allegiance he pays to his creative muse. She is, "A crazy queen, old and jealous" whose dictatorial commandment, "Kneel down before me" (U 20), he prefers to break rather than keep. Jung says that of the various aspects of the mother archetype, the Church is one aspect (FA 15; par. 156) which, in Ulysses, is represented by May Dedalus who, together with Ireland or Dublin and the Church, forms the "maternal triad" from which he seeks his escape (Fitzpatrick 124). The "Roman catholic and apostolic church" (U 20) demands everything from him, including his freedom of choice, both the Church and mother having the same expectation: "Kneel down before me." He rebels against any act of sycophancy towards this perversion that passes for 'wisdom'--of old age, religion or nationalism.

All these aspects finally coalesce in the figurative image of the grandmother evoked in Stephen's riddle, (U 26), which he himself answers: "The fox burying his grandmother under the hollybush" (U 27). According to Jungian theory, the qualities attached to the mother are now transferred to the grandmother who, figuratively speaking, is being buried by the fox. The grandmother functions as a symbol encompassing mother, Church and country. While Jungians have taken pains to analyze the mother archetype in detail, none have commented on the changes it has undergone in its version as the grandmother in Ulysses and its impact on Stephen's individuation. The general trend is to analyze the negative effect of the mother archetype on Stephen's creativity and his attempts to escape from the same. But Jungian criticism has missed the finer points in Stephen's attempts brought to the fore by the grandmother archetype which Joyce has creatively exploited in the novel, notably in "Circe." The fox refers to Stephen the son,
the apostate, and the Irish nationalist and artist, as well as to George Fox, the founder of
the doctrine of the Inner Light. All are burying in turn the mother's memory, Irish
nationalism and cultural heritage, the Church and the secret complexities of a riddle,
whose answer is enmeshed with Stephen's own personal secrets. Stephen is burying not
the grandmother but the Grand Mother of all mothers--his own mother's deathbed
memory, Church and country.

Teaching maths to the shy, retiring Sargent, he wonders about the individual
secrets of teacher and student: “Secrets, silent, stony sit in the dark palaces of both our
hearts: secrets weary of their tyranny: tyrants willing to be dethroned” (U 28). “Dark
palaces” may be interpreted as a reference to the collective unconscious containing the
archetypes equivalent to Joyce's “secrets.” Stephen's attempt to dethrone the secret
tyrrants is the effort made by his conscious mind to confront his unconscious and the
archetypes which exert their tyrannical influence over him. Probably, the riddle is the
beginning of such an attempt where he speaks in a coded language to avoid facing the
unpleasant facts of reality.

His secrets also include the ones which have been told to him in confidence, one
such instance being Kevin Egan's storehouse of the memorabilia of Irish history: “Of
Ireland, the Dalcaassians, of hopes, conspiracies, of Arthur Griffith now” (U 43). As Egan
narrates them his “fustian shirt, sanguineflowered, trembles its Spanish tassels at his
secrets” (U 43), a reminder of his mother's “secrets”--the “tasselled dancecards” (U 9)--
kept in her drawer. As unofficial historian and Sinn Feiner, Egan recounts the high
points of Irish history, its not so widely known subterranean movements--“lost leaders,
the betrayed, wild escapes. Disguises, clutched at, gone, not here” (U 43). The troubled
and conflict-ridden relationship of Ireland and the English, the IRA and its subterfuges, the heroics of Parnell, the inception of the Sinn Fein as the political wing of the IRA, and the efforts of nationalists like Griffith, which are encapsulated as the secret lore of Irish history, feature in this flashback. Stephen’s personal secrets are ruling the secret palaces of his collective unconscious, the country’s secrets silently embodied in the milkwoman, while Egan’s garrulous narration reveals more. All these secrets will finally congregate and be revealed in the encompassing figure of the grandmother.

It is in “Circe” that Stephen’s tyrannical secret explodes on the scene of its final ‘dethronement,’ as he confronts the figure of his mother as well as the grandmother, the carrier of all his secrets. The changed words in the riddle (U/558) succeed in working like a magic formula for the release of the “poor soul” of his mother from heaven. “The rite is the poet’s rest,” (U/503) Stephen claims, the rite of the final act of creation being an elusive goal for him because it depends on a more crucial rite he has to perform first—the exorcism of his mother’s ghost which will ensure that his mind and psyche will finally be at rest. At the slight inversion in the riddle, his mother’s ghost which had ascended to heaven according to the earlier version of the riddle (U/26), now leaves its abode and descends to meet him, demanding his spirit’s allegiance to her spirit and to God.

Stephen’s meeting with his mother in “Circe” signifies a meeting with institutionalized religion, her lopsided bridal attire (U/579) functioning as Joyce’s mocking statement on the pathetic corpse-like condition of the Church as the Bride of Christ. As a figurehead of the Roman Catholic Church she stalks her prey with her oppressive moral regime, aiming for a forced subjugation of artistic imagination to
theological authoritarianism. But acting like one of Jung’s difficult patients, Joyce’s hero refuses a negotiation with the archetype, taking to the physical act of separation by breaking the lamp shade (the darkness of the unconscious descends once more) and fleeing the place. The unconscious, however, tries to effect a Nemesis-like return in the more terrifying aspect of the grandmother who is awaiting her turn.

Getting away from his dead mother’s overpowering presence, Stephen’s ruminations turn to history: “History to blame. Fabled by mothers of memory” (U 587). In Nestor, history had been fabled by the “daughters of memory” (U 24), the change to “mothers” in “Circe,” a further amplification of the theme of secrecy that informs the course of Irish history with its events of betrayals, conspiracies and disguise. Ireland is represented here by the Grand Mother, who, disguised as old Gummy Granny, the buried grandmother of the riddle, will now take centre stage. Both Stephen’s personal history and his country’s secrets are being retold by the “mothers of memory,” a revoking of the traditional mythological fabling by the “daughters of memory.” The myth changes to include new characters--Stephen’s mother and the milkwoman, “the mothers of memory,” who coalesce into a single figure--the grandmother of memory, Gummy Granny.

Stephen blames history and decides to rectify its abuses against his country by killing "the priest and the king" (U 589)--the imperialism of religion and monarchy--in his mind with his "Non serviam!" (U 582). He finds himself facing an encounter with old Gummy Granny who, as a potent representative of Ireland, tries to provoke him into liberating his motherland through violence. Her appearance itself is suggestive of Irish lore and history: ("in sugarloaf hat... seated on a toadstool, the deathflower of the
As a changed version of her earlier counterpart, the old milkwoman of “Telemachus,” she resembles her, “a witch on her toadstool,” and symbolizes the Irish past, the Great Famine of the 1840s which had ravaged Ireland’s potato crop and thereby her economy. Stephen recognizes her as “grammer” (grandmother), who in a manner similar to Hamlet’s father’s ghost, desires revenge (U 595). Like his own mother, the “corpsechewer” (U 581), she is the “old sow that eats her farrow, (U 595) an aspect of Jung’s Terrible Mother, a bipolar aspect of the mother archetype (AOF 144; par. 309) who is malevolent and murderous as the mother country for whose cause of nationalism, her countrymen are expected to die.

The ‘grand’ mother archetype provides Joyce with the appropriate vehicle for expressing his contempt and lack of sympathy for pseudo nationalism--a brutal brand that creates martyrs with its demand for violent acts of ‘valour.’ By burying her (in the riddle) and satirically resurrecting her as a character from a fairy tale at a later point, Joyce explodes the notion of nationalism, exposing it for what it is: a myth. The nationalist propaganda about the reality of Ireland and the Irish condition is ultimately a fictitious, rhetorical fabrication--a reified entity which is completely decontextualized from its roots.

This is followed by voices crying out, “Dublin’s burning!” (U 598), a Black Mass is performed (U 599) (signifying the death of Ireland?), and old Gummy Granny in a last bid to activate Stephen, offers him a dagger to kill the redcoats (representing England) with the promise: “At 8.35 a. m. you will be in heaven and Ireland will be free” (U 600). Finding himself elevated as the Messiah for Ireland, Stephen decides to slight her back in reciprocal vengeance. He refuses the dagger thrust at him (physical action) in favour of
“Non serviam!” (spiritual action through art) denying Ireland her freedom from imperial rule through violence. As an aspect of Jung’s “wicked fairy,” she tries to beguile him into striking at monarchy and achieving national freedom. Jungian theory states that the Great Mother splits into opposites of the “good fairy and wicked fairy” (FA 36; par. 189). In Ulysses, Ireland as the wicked fairy, the “sow that eats her farrow” appears early in “Proteus” in the guise of the drink, “green fairy,” that Kevin Egan has as a catalyst to make him talk, “the green fairy’s fang thrusting between his lips” (U 43). Here the “green fairy” as the malevolent figure of Ireland, makes her devouring presence felt so strongly that Stephen can almost feel her presence, “Green eyes, I see you. Fang, I feel” (U 43), a foreboding of his mother’s appearance in “Circe,” where the “green crab” is out to get him with its “grinning claws” (U 582). Personally, Stephen does not have the “green fairy” drink—the stimulant of institutionalized patriotism is one he prefers to avoid. The confrontation with the mother archetype promises him freedom (a place in heaven) through the moral action of repentance while the ‘grand’ mother archetype offers him the same—political emancipation through the physical act of violence. He rejects both as the ethics of neither appeal to him—he flees the scene of a showdown with the mother archetype and later, finds himself knocked out of the second round with the grandmother as well.

While Gummy Granny represents the acme of the national representation of Ireland, Joyce weaves in further variations on the mother archetype into the novel through selective images of mostly humble, ordinary old women from Irish life. Along with the more dominating images of the old milkwoman and Gummy Granny, they form a configuration that expresses their wisdom, a deep knowledge of life and its inner
mysteries and secrets. As erstwhile custodians of the past, they evoke the present reality of Ireland as well. In the picture of queen Victoria as an "Old hag with the yellow teeth" (U 43), is the image of a decaying imperialism struggling for control. As Dignam's funeral cortège is about to move, Bloom see's from the carriage window, "an old woman peeping" from behind the blind, probably waiting for her turn to die (U 87). This image of the anticipation of death has already been echoed in the "bent hag" crossing the street (U 61), who reappears in "Circe" to rescue Ireland from British imperialism, saying, "Let them go and fight the Boers!" (U 602), emphasizing the reality of a dying Ireland. These images of old age with their connotation of reproductive failure signify a failure of the basic drive of life in Ireland to grow and to mature.

Mrs. Thornton, the midwife who assisted at Rudy's birth was an all-wise woman too, who, in her wisdom "knew at once" that Rudy would die soon (U 66). Through the theme of Rudy's premature death and the reference to the nursery rhyme character of the old woman with a shoeful of children (U 161), the national issue of famine-induced immigration is introduced-- the theme of the death of a country that never came to full maturity thus getting an added emphasis. The beautiful Molly who represents life amidst all these images of old age is glad that she is not "an old shrivelled hag" (U 777). Ironically, this queen, who "was in her bedroom, eating bread and" (U 75), butter not honey, is not an "old hag with yellow teeth," but a middleaged woman, Dublin's prima donna who possesses enough worldly wisdom about men and sex.

All these allusions to old age, particularly to old women, function as interesting variations on Jung's archetype of the Wise Old Man. This archetype "represents knowledge... insight, wisdom... intuition... and... moral qualities such as goodwill
and readiness to help" (FA 100; par.406) and being bipolar, also exhibits qualities that are not so "morally good" (FA 93; par.397). In *Ulysses*, however, these characteristics are found in Joyce's individualistic representation of the Wise Old Woman (as symbolized by the old milkwoman and old Gummy Granny) rather than in his reproduction of the Jungian archetype of the Wise Old Man.

In the novel, the old and experienced Mr. Deasy with his age-old diatribe against the Jews and Jewish history is also, in typically Joycean fashion, debunked when he is made to become subservient to the young Stephen's wisdom. Mr. Deasy, as headmaster and teacher, expounds his views on public economy and holds forth on his own remedy for the national problem of the foot and mouth disease among the cattle (*U* 32-33). Stephen is scornful and bored: "The same room . . . the same wisdom: and I the same. Three times now. Three nooses round me here" (*U* 30). And then in youthful arrogance dwells on his own self-importance: "Is this old wisdom? He waits to hear from me’ (*U* 34), and soon obliges the old man with a pompous stroke from the lancet of his own art: "History is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake” (*U* 34). Mr. Deasy refers to all history being teleological, moving "towards one great goal," but his so-called ancient wisdom stands exposed as bombast when Stephen refers to the footballers' shouts of goal, "a shout in the street" (*U* 34) as God. Joyce's deliberate subversion of the archetype of the Wise Old Man implies that women are better suited to express the secrets of the motherland's history. Hence the wide spectrum of women ranging from the milkwoman to Gummy Granny and all her variations.

A comparison of the Wise Old Woman and the Wise Old Man reveals the interesting fact that while the former as represented by Gummy Granny, propels Stephen
into some action, even resistance, the latter does not succeed in touching Stephen's life in any way despite the narration of his "Glorious, pious and immortal memory" (U/31). But Joyce may be applauding the old man's commonsensical wisdom that tackles the practical issues that can bother a nation. Stephen mocks at the diluted version of the old man's historical sense while his own, in anticipation of his meeting with the "mothers of memory," contains a sense of foreboding: "History is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake." Stephen is cynical about a wisdom that knows more than he does, that has a reverence for a past he cannot share simply because his own nightmarish secrets cry out for an immediate resolution. Joyce uses this interplay of the wisdom of Old Man, Old Woman and Young Man to express the crucial point that no wisdom can really come to Ireland's (or Stephen's) help at this stage. Even Bloom's grandfather, the 'grand' Old Man, Virag Lipoti, who appears in "Circe" (U/511) with his scientific-sexual lore represents nothing but the degeneration and rottenness of the Irish condition.

Jungian analyses of the mother archetype thus gloss over the numerous significant variations on this archetype and, as a result, absolutize it. A similar treatment is meted out to the anima, as it is symbolized by Molly. A definite and clear relationship is established between Molly and Stephen on the grounds that this is "inner" and "symbolic" and does not need any outward expression. But as Stephen does not even have a conscious encounter with Molly (or with his dead mother for that matter), the argument that Molly is his anima has its own limitations. Jung's claim that it is an encounter "not many can bring... off" is not enough to explain away Stephen's meeting with Molly that never takes place. For it is Jung's responsibility to see that the analysand confronts the anima in order that the therapy can be successful. But if Stephen is inching
his way to so-called self-realization, Molly certainly does not play the part of anima in his life. For though she is reputed to be "Dublin's prime favourite," (U 7: 135), Stephen has not even heard her sing and even in the cabman's shelter in "Eumaeus," he does not take more than a cursory interest in her photograph (U 652-53). She plays too peripheral a role in his life to have anything to do with his future artistic achievement. Till the end Molly Bloom remains only a "suggestion" of Bloom's (U 702); Stephen knows her, not as a three-dimensional personality, but merely as a name, a photograph and a lighted window.

On the other hand, Joyce has predictably circumvented the Jungians by providing Stephen with an anima of a completely different sort. While Molly means nothing to Stephen because he hardly knows her, the thought of sexually desirable women is uppermost in his mind. At twenty-two life is exciting because his fantasies are not confined to a particular woman; instead, they are peopled by women and women. The voyeur in him hopes that the "fubsy widow" (U 40) would provide him some more leg show while he imagines "naked women" (U 40) on top of trams. The sight of the woman cocklepicker in "Proteus" makes him desire her as a sexual object and he gives in to his carnal thoughts about her--"A she-fiend's whiteness under her rancid rags"--and imagines now that he is naked (U 47) as he starts yearning for a physical relationship with a woman. Stephen's recollections of women include also the "virgin at Hodges Figgis' window" (U 48), all these imaginary meetings coming to a climax in his visit to the whorehouse where he meets not the anima but 'animi'--the prostitutes in Bella Cohen's brothel. Besides dancing with Zoe and Kitty, he is upset to hear that Georgina Johnson, his favourite whore, is married and gone, sounding almost betrayed (U 559).
She is the anima he has encountered in flesh and blood. Jung says as much when he claims that “the first bearer of the soul image is the mother” but afterwards the anima is projected on “women who arouse the man’s feelings” (*AOF* 86; par.4), and so this is the nearest he comes to encountering this archetype.

A critical analysis of the novel must, finally, scrutinize the process of individuation and examine whether and how it actually comes about. Stephen’s self-realization is usually interpreted by Jungian criticism as an account of his attempt to overcome his involvement in the circumstances leading to his mother’s death, including his refusal to give in to her dying request to pray for her. This results in his guilt over her death and in his inability to forget her. Without exception, the mother archetype is regarded as the singular reason for his inability to create. So Molly, the diametrically opposite female, is considered to be the vehicle for his rebirth. The sole reason for such a view seems to be that these characters fit the Jungian role and provide the critics with a chance to ‘apply’ the Jungian theory of the archetypes. In this context, the possibility of the child archetype featuring in Stephen’s self-realization is a textual event completely overshadowed by the zeal for discovering the grass in greener pastures—the more well known archetypes of the shadow and the anima. In the following analysis I propose to show that Joyce’s use of the child archetype is an extremely important happening which has a significant role to play in the process of Stephen’s growth.

The concept of the child archetype can be understood only within the context of Jung’s theory of individuation to which a brief reference will now be made. According to Jungian theory, individuation is a process by which the analysand integrates the conscious and unconscious elements of his psyche in order to secure mental equilibrium
for himself or herself. This is done by the subject consciously confronting the unconscious and its contents, i.e., the archetypes. To integrate these two halves of the psyche, says Jung, “open conflict and open collaboration” are at once needed (288; vol.9, pt.1, par.522) and through this psychic operation, “emerge new situations and new conscious attitudes” (289; vol.9, pt.1, par.524). A new synthesis of the self is achieved and the personality is rounded off into a holistic entity. According to the Jungians, this is the psychological manoeuvre Stephen attempts in the novel when his consciousness confronts the mother archetype and then collaborates with Molly. The implication is that by thus dealing with the unconscious he becomes a more balanced and mature personality ready for the higher calling of an artist. But as we have just seen, Stephen is unable to have any conscious encounter with either of them and so the textual evidence does not support the idea of his achieving self-realization through these two versions of the anima. In this context, we shall examine the crucial nature of the role played by the child archetype in the process of Stephen’s individuation.

Jung says, “One of the essential features of the child motif is its futurity” (164; vol.9, pt.1, par.278), i.e., the child is potential future. He says that as “enlargers of consciousness” the child archetypes anticipate the future by bringing in light, and overcoming darkness (169; vol.9, pt.1, par.288). Ulysses offers a dramatic illustration in Rudy’s appearance in “Circe,” where Bloom’s mind suddenly conjures him up as he stands next to the prostrate body of the unconscious Stephen. The “figure appears slowly, a fairy boy of eleven, dressed in . . . a bronze helmet, holding a book in his hand. . . . He reads from right to left inaudibly, smiling, kissing the page. . . . In his free left hand he holds a slim ivory cane. . . .” (U 609). Jungian theory states that the child appears in the
dreamer's dreams as his "son or daughter" (159; vol.9, pt.1, par.270) and so Bloom's vision of Rudy enlightens him about Stephen's future which is not revealed to Stephen himself but is made known to the reader of Ulysses through Bloom's perception of it. Jung makes the important point that the "'child' paves the way for a future change of personality" (164; vol.9, pt.1, par.278), and so it is natural that the process of Stephen's growth should be merely implied at this stage and his future as a writer symbolized by an open book. The child archetype is important in indicating that Stephen's self-realization is a possibility embedded in the future, not the present. The transition from hat to bronze helmet and ashplant to ivory cane suggests the near-heroic status of a deified figure that Stephen as literary artist is destined to become. Jung says that the child looks sometimes like a "child god," sometimes like a "young hero" (165; vol.9, pt.1, par.281) and usually has a "mysterious and miraculous birth" (167; vol.9, pt.1, par.285). Joyce in his typical fashion shows how Rudy is probably conceived after Molly saw "two dogs at it" (1/89).

"'Child' means something "evolving towards independence" (168; vol.9, pt.1, par.287), says Jung, and Stephen is clearly on the threshold of becoming independent of the shackles of the memories of mother, country and Church. The child possesses "powers far exceeding those of ordinary humanity" (170; vol.9, pt.1, par.289) and as an artist, Stephen definitely holds the more responsible task of speaking for his epoch. Rudy anticipates the "figure that comes from the synthesis of the conscious and unconscious elements in the personality" (164; vol.9, pt.1, par.278) but as Stephen is completely unconscious, he does not achieve any self-realization as such; it is the conscious Bloom who anticipates Stephen's future and informs the reader about it. This is quite natural for if Stephen represents the immature Joyce at twenty-two, it is obvious that the one who is...
undergoing a process cannot at the same time understand it either. He is simply not
conscious of it. But Bloom as the onlooker, is able to see the end product as he has the
objectivity of consciousness to see the conclusion of a subjective process.

Thus, it is through Bloom’s vision of Stephen’s future that we get an indication of
the fact that Stephen will finally manage to overthrow the negative influence of his
mother’s memory by dethroning the tyrannical secrets that have held sway over his mind.
After this encounter with the child archetype, any encounter with the anima as Molly
becomes redundant. So the Jungians need not strive to unite Stephen with Molly
anymore as the text itself precludes such a reading. Stephen’s quest does not end here,
and after the cocoa session in Bloom’s house he leaves 7, Eccles Street with his
“Diaconal Hat on Ashplant” (U 698), and we as readers realize that he is destined to
become an artist. Individuation for the artist involves the evolution of the personality that
discourages a solipsistic self-obsession; instead, it “gathers the world to oneself” (226;
vol.8, par.432) and achieves a synthesis within the self which implicitly includes an
integration with the larger world outside. Probably, Joyce refers to this when he records
Stephen’s thoughts thus:

   Every life is many days, day after day. We walk through
   ourselves, meeting robbers, ghosts, giants, old men, young
   men, wives, widows, brothers-in-love. But always meeting
   ourselves. (U 213)

The concept of Stephen’s self-realization, as analyzed by Jungian criticism, is
therefore, marked by an exclusive interest in developing the role of the mother archetype
as such and not in its representation of Ireland and the Church and the role they play in
Stephen’s transformation into a mature artist in the future. *Ulysses* supplies enough evidence of the complex nature of this influence through its symbolic representation. Throughout the novel, we see Stephen (who is paralyzed himself) rebelling against the general all-round paralysis his country and the Church are gripped by. Only the detachment of the creative process can rescue him from a reality he too is a part of. Stephen’s self-realization remains incomplete without overcoming not only his mother’s influence, but that of his country and the Church, which are so inextricably interwoven in his thoughts and experience. For only after reconciliation with the three vital aspects of the unconscious can he hope for artistic evolution. For Joyce, the writing of *Ulysses* depended on this.

* * *

It is worth noting that there is a refreshing contrast between Jung’s awareness of psychic depths and the ‘disciples’” business-like approach to the archetypes, as if they are commodities to be classified and packaged, as if, further, the contents of the psyche can ever be completely understood by psychoanalysis. For Jung himself ascribes to the psyche an “inmost mystery,” having its own “peculiar structure and form,” disclaiming any notions regarding the sanctity of the archetypes originating there. And yet, Jungian critics are concerned more with the universal archetypes rather than with the individual inflections they receive in particular representations. As we have seen, the Jungians have managed to build an elaborate but flimsy superstructure on the basis of Jung’s review of *Ulysses* and his theory of the archetypes. As a result, they have come up with their brands of “subjective confessions” on the archetypal aspect of the novel. The result of such a gross imposition is a body of criticism that tries to outdo itself in its efforts to
retain Joyce in the “church... of psychoanalysis” to which he never felt he belonged (Ellmann, *UJ* 642).

A study of Jungian criticism shows that the archetypes have been abstractified, decontextualized and dehistoricized before being isolated for critical attention. Jung himself says that it is “hopeless” to “tear a single archetype out of the living tissue of the psyche; but despite interwovenness they do form units of meaning that can be apprehended intuitively” (179; vol.9, pt.1, par.302). Instead of being perceived as a compulsion or force that is experienced through the daily empirical details of life, the archetypes are uprooted from the context of Jungian theory and made to serve the purposes of a criticism which is solely interested in labels that fit.

The archetypes, taken independently, function as leitmotifs running through *Ulysses*, enhancing its richness. They go through various transformations and variations within the text, thus giving a creative depth to ambiguity itself as part of the Joycean aesthetic. It is significant that Joyce expresses his own complex and ambivalent relationship with his mother, Church, country and art through his creative exploitation of the archetypes. By doing this, he proves that they did not belong to the exclusive domain of psychology and that a work of art could not only accommodate them but also use them to deepen the significance of the message that art conveys.

In Jung’s practice of psychotherapy, these archetypes and their negotiation have an ethical value because of the therapeutic nature of the procedure involved. In literature, particularly in *Ulysses*, they have a value that is more aesthetic, their technical and contextual function of greater importance than their therapeutic, if any. Jungian readings of the text have, however, based their criticism of *Ulysses* on an inflexible interpretation
of concept of archetypes without making any allowance for the variations or turns Joyce introduced. Critics have, therefore, passionately looked for correspondences rather than points of departure. The result is a corpus of criticism that sees *Ulysses* as a literary analogue of a Jungian text and puts the “event of Bloomsday into a Jungian frame, assigning Jungian identities to the main characters in the drama and following them, in these Jungian identities, through the day” (Kimball, "JSU" 196). The organizational technique of *Ulysses* is ample proof that what this school of criticism subjected it to out of self-interest was, probably, never more than just a tool in Joyce’s hands.

The Jungian criticism of *Ulysses* thus, uproots the archetypes from their empirical base in Irish history and subjects them to a rigid Jungian reading. The hallmark of the Joycean text, however, is its divergence from well-worn concepts; this insight is absent in the analyses of the Jungians who have chosen to ignore Jung’s insistence on the many-sidedness of the archetypes. Stephen, as the principal member of the “archetypal family,” receives much attention—his individuation is analyzed as the process of the ego meeting the shadow and the anima, the concept having no relationship with the complexities of Irish history. This view is carried forward in the next chapter where Frygian criticism uses a different set of theoretical principles to extend the study of Stephen’s quest for self-realization. The Jungian theme of spirituality-carnality-fertility is merely recast into the Frygian mold of the birth-death-rebirth pattern and interpreted in studied isolation from the historical referent. The conclusions, it will be seen, are not different from the ones we have already considered.

* * *
Notes


2 For further details see Attridge 272-73; Ellmann, *The Consciousness of Joyce*, Kimball "Jung's 'Dual Mother' " 477, 481-82, and Ellmann, *James Joyce* 692.

3 See Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's Ulysses,* Ellmann's *James Joyce,* and Budgen for a comprehensive treatment of this topic.

4 See Graves 21-22 for an interesting and lively account of how an Irish *filí* or seer could, as a means of vengeance, "compose a satire on his assailant which would bring black blotches on his face and turn his bowels to water." Joyce probably enjoyed this self-inherited role and made the most of it.

5 See Kimball, "A Jungian Scenario" 195-205; "From Eve to Helen" 29-40; "Jung's 'Dual Mother' " 477-90; Fitzpatrick 123-43 and Walcott 37-47 for detailed analyses of this theme.

6 See the aforementioned.

7 Kimball has a detailed discussion to offer in her essay "From Eve to Helen: Stages of the Anima-Figure in Joyce's *Ulysses*" 29-40.

8 While both Kimball and Fitzpatrick analyze this archetype, Kimball's essay is a more thorough and well-researched treatment of this topic.

9 The Jungian analyses of Walcott, Fitzpatrick and Kimball prove this in ample measure.
Kimball uses Jung's identification of the four stages of Woman for the purposes of this essay. They are Eve, Helen of Troy, the Virgin Mary and Sophia. Eve is equated with mother, Helen with the anima proper as the erotic and romantic object, Mary with "spiritual motherhood" and Sophia with the "eternal feminine" or wisdom (Jung 174; vol.16).

Both Fitzpatrick and Kimball offer an explication of this idea in their writings.

See Elizabeth A Livingstone ed. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the English Church* 202-03, for an exposition of George Fox's central doctrine of the Inner Light, considered to be an anti-Church stand because of his belief that truth was found in God's inner voice speaking to the soul.

For a detailed interpretation, see Ellmann, "Ulysses" on the Liffey 143.