

A Horrible Example of Free Thought: God in Stephen's *Ulysses*

GEERT LERNOUT

Abstract

Focusing on the episodes in *Ulysses* where Stephen appears, this paper explores Stephen's, and implicitly Joyce's, stances toward religious belief. The paper takes as its points of departure the reference or allusion to religious belief and explicates these through a radiating exposition of related history and thought. The exposition considerably extends what has been recorded to date, and the paper's appendix translates new material detailing Joyce's fascination for the adoration of the Holy Prepuce.

In the last eighty years James Joyce has managed to fascinate readers of different cultures and of different backgrounds. Although his work is thoroughly local by virtue of being firmly rooted in middle-class Dublin, in the first decades of its reception his work paradoxically appealed first and foremost to readers outside of his native city. It is only in the last two decades that Ireland has adopted its most famous writer-in-exile. Despite its apparent parochialism (with the exception of a few poems and *Giacomo Joyce*, which is in many different ways exceptional, all his works are situated in Dublin), Joyce's work manages to appeal to readers all over the Western world and even beyond. Recently the young Burmese writer Pascal Khoo Thwe described how after growing up as a member of an ethnic minority in a small village in Burma, he became interested in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, which led to a meeting with an Oxford don, his involvement in civil rights action and ultimately his escape and exile.

There is another aspect to the strange cultural universalism of Joyce's work, and that is the issue of religion. It is less of an accident that *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* had such an appeal for the young Pascal Khoo Thwe, who was educated by Italian priests and briefly planned to go to a seminary. Joyce's first novel seems to have a great

attraction for young catholic males who struggle or have struggled with the same questions of sex and guilt that form the core of that novel. Despite the fact that the appeal of Joyce's work is much more catholic than Catholic, it is this religious dimension of his work that I would like to focus on here. We all know that (the loss of) religion is a major theme in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and we find similar concerns in *Dubliners* and in *Stephen Hero*. While Joyce's own attitude to the faith of his family was probably just as negative as that of the protagonist of his autobiographical novels, catholic critics have been prepared to rescue the writer for the faith. This is usually effected by showing how until the end of his life Joyce continued to be fascinated by the detail of catholic ritual and doctrine and by quoting the writer's more ambiguous pronouncements about his attitude to the church. Revisionist work like this has enabled some scholars to claim that the writer may never even have left the catholic church.

This is not the place to argue at length an issue that is essentially biographical, but it certainly seems more than a bit perverse to attempt to include a person in a group that he himself has gone to such great lengths to distance himself from. Especially if the rules of the church of Rome cannot but exclude him. In 1904, within months of meeting her, he wrote to the woman he fell in love with: "Six years ago I left the Catholic Church, hating it most fervently. I found it impossible for me to remain in it on account of the impulses of my nature. I made secret war upon it when I was a student and declined to accept the positions it offered me. . . . Now I make open war upon it by what I write and say and do" (*Let II*: 48). Although Nora Joyce seems to have retained her faith, she respected her partner's opinion to the point of having her grandchild baptised without his knowledge and by refusing a priest at his funeral with a reply that is supremely touching if you consider that she must have believed that the ritual could save his eternal soul: "I could not do that to him." Joyce himself never made a secret of his views. When requested by officials to indicate his religion (at a time when these things were less innocent than they are now), the writer always made sure to write "senza confessione" or one of its equivalents. But what concerns me here is not the religious beliefs of Joyce the man, but the treatment of religion by the writer in *Ulysses*. It seems best at present to limit this enquiry to the attitudes of Stephen Dedalus. In a way, the novel represents two moments, the decline and fall of the hero of *A Portrait*, on the one hand, and the rise and triumph of Leopold Bloom, who over the course of the novel becomes its center of attention and only hero. It seems preferable to

separate the two heroes and their quite different relationships with religion.

That catholicism—which Joyce spells with a lower-case *c*, as he does with all names of religions (and as I will do too)—is central to the novel is clear from its very first page, with the parody of the Mass which Buck Mulligan has begun to perform even before Stephen Dedalus enters the scene. Mulligan’s mocking blasphemy is greeted by a “displeased and sleepy” Stephen, who is after all greeted by the mock priest as if he were possessed by devils, who is later called a “jejune jesuit”, and who chooses not to partipate in the parody of the ritual. Neither does he seem to even briefly consider Mulligan’s plans: of going to Greece with his friend, of learning Greek or of hellenising Ireland together. It is ironical that it is the blaspheming pseudo-priest who questions Stephen’s refusal to kneel down to pray when his dying mother asked him to. Interestingly, Mulligan expresses his intellectual solidarity with his friend in these terms: “I’m hyperborean as much as you” (*U* 1.92). In “*Ulysses*” *Annotated* Gifford and Seidman refer the reader to the introduction of *The Anti-Christ* where Nietzsche uses the phrase to refer to the *Übermensch* who is “not enslaved by conformity to the dictates of traditional Christian morality.” We know that Mulligan has read his Nietzsche because in a little while, just before diving into the sea, he will jokingly claim to be the *Übermensch*.

Like his contemporaries Yeats and AE, Joyce was interested, apart from the most obvious anti-religious thinkers such as Nietzsche, in the work of the authors of heretical works, and it has hitherto escaped attention that the first episode of the novel contains a reference to one such sect. In his mockery of the Eucharist on the opening page of *Ulysses*, Mulligan’s reference to “the genuine christine” refers to *The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus the Christ* by Levi H. Dowling, an American preacher who was told as a child by an angel to “build a white city,” which turned out to be the text of *The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus, the Christ of the Piscean Age*, an alternative gospel in which idiosyncratically the followers of Christ are called “christines” and their church “the christine church.”

When Mulligan disappears downstairs, Stephen’s thoughts turn to his mother’s death, but at no point does he entertain even vaguely religious ideas: it is only when we realise this, that we notice that nearly all of the references to God or to Jesus in the first chapter are Mulligan’s exclusively. Most of the time these references come in the form of expletives (“God, isn’t he dreadful?”, “God! he said quietly”, “God knows what poxy bowsy left them off”, “God knows you have more spirit

than any of them”, “God, Kinch, if you and I could only work together we might do something for the island”, “What happened in the name of God?”, “Do, for Jesus’ sake, Buck Mulligan said. For my sake and for all our sakes”). Stephen never uses the Lord’s name in vain, while Mulligan even turns the breakfast into an irreverent parody of a prayer, a blessing and the Eucharist.

When the milkwoman enters the room, her innocent reference to the weather (“That’s a lovely morning, sir, she said. Glory be to God”) is immediately explained to Haines: “The islanders, Mulligan said to Haines casually, speak frequently of the collector of prepuces” (*U* 1.393-4). He expresses his sentiments in a circumlocutory language that is designed not to be understood by the third party, but circumcision was a theme that we can document Joyce having been interested in while he was writing *Ulysses*. In one of the new *Ulysses* notebooks that are now in the National Library of Ireland, we find under the title “Jesus” and among notes from at least one other source, a number of references to the catholic veneration of Christ’s foreskin. These were taken from a pamphlet written by Alphons Victor Müller under the title *Die hochheilige Vorhaut Christi im Kult und in der Theologie der Papstkirche*, published in Berlin in 1907. This book, written by a Dominican historian who not only converted to protestantism but who became an anti-catholic propagandist, left only one trace in the text of *Ulysses*, to be discussed later. That the subject interested Joyce is clear from a reference to the process of circumcision which Joyce noted down while reading *The Life and Works of Saint Paul* by Dean F.W. Farrar and left in that book of the Trieste Library.¹

When Stephen, Mulligan and Haines finish their breakfast and are ready to leave the tower for a swim, Mulligan continues his parodic identification with Jesus, this time with reference to the “way of the cross” and to the gospel: “Mulligan is stripped of his garments”, “And going forth he met Butterly”. When Haines mentions Stephen’s supposedly theological interpretation of Hamlet, Mulligan takes this as his cue to sing his blasphemous “Ballad of Joking Jesus.” Haines cautions Stephen: “We oughtn’t to laugh, I suppose. He’s rather blasphemous”, and after enquiring about the song’s title he continues: “You’re not a believer, are you? Haines asked. I mean, a believer in the narrow sense of the word. Creation from nothing and miracles and a personal God” (*U* 1.611-3). This is a fair description of a general orthodox form of christian belief, as opposed to not just the atheist or agnostic positions but also to most deist options. But as a jejune jesuit, Stephen will have none of that: “There’s only one sense of the word, it seems to me” (*U* 1.615). With this

statement Stephen certainly confirms Mulligan's analysis that he has "the cursed jesuit strain in you, only it's injected the wrong way". Readers of *A Portrait* know that for Stephen there can only be a choice between catholicism ("an absurdity that is logical and coherent") and a radical and complete lack of belief. Protestantism ("an absurdity that is illogical and incoherent") is simply not an option. When Haines repeats his question about the idea of a personal God, Stephen replies: "You behold in me, Stephen said with grim displeasure, a horrible example of free thought" (*U* 1.625-6). Gifford and Seidman are correct in believing that the word "free thought" refers to "thought free from the dictates of 'Christian revelation,'" but Stephen's position is not in any way related to the rationalist deism of Anthony Collins, to which the *Annotations* refer. By the end of the nineteenth century, "free thought" had become a synonym of the militant atheism that from the eighties of the nineteenth century often went hand in hand with various forms of radical liberalism, anarchism and socialism, especially in England, France, Italy and Belgium. In the French translation of the novel supervised by Joyce this sentence is given as "libre pensée," and in the German version as "eines Freidenkers," of a freethinker. Despite the careful choice of distancing words ("grim displeasure" and "horrible example"), Stephen here comes closest to expressing his ideological commitment, and it is no coincidence that he chooses the archaic and biblical verb "behold" for this purpose.

Only now does Stephen begin to contemplate religion and the "holy Roman catholic and apostolic church" with the Latin translation of the description of the Roman church from the *Credo* of Palestrina's *Missae Papae Marcelli*. From the beginning there is the realisation that the catholic claim for apostolic authority is vain because Stephen contemplates "the slow growth and change of rite and dogma, like his own rare thoughts, a chemistry of stars" (*U* 1.652-3). One of the earliest forms of a dogmatic creed was the "Symbol of the Apostles" or "Apostles' Creed," which in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was believed to have been expressed, one dogma at a time, by the twelve apostles at Pentecost, but which is now thought to date from the late fourth century.² It was replaced somewhat later at the Council of Nicea by a different form that anathematised Arius and his followers. A second ecumenical council in Constantinople expanded the role of the Holy Ghost in the Creed and added the phrase about the One Church quoted by Joyce.

For Stephen, behind the beauty of the voices in Palestrina's Mass stands "the vigilant angel of the church militant" Michael, who disarms and menaces the heretics. This conjures up an image of a

horde of heresies fleeing with mitres awry: Photius and the brood of mockers of whom Mulligan was one, and Arius, warring his life long upon the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and Valentine, spurning Christ's terrene body, and the subtle African heresiarch Sabellius who held that the Father was Himself His own Son. (*U* 1.656-60)

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* is authoritative for Joyce's notions of church doctrine, not only because it offers a good view of the thinking of the catholic church in the first quarter of the twentieth century, but mostly because it was a major source of Joyce's knowledge about catholicism.

Let us take a closer look at the heretics in this quotation, in their historical order and with some help from the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. The earliest heretic is the father of gnosticism. Valentine was condemned by the church father Tertullian in his treatise against heresy, but some contemporary historians of the early church believe that his gnostic version of christianity may represent a form much closer to the teachings of the early christians than some of the contemporary teachings that would only become orthodox in a later period. In any case gnosticism was older than christianity and its dualism was the result of a blending of Greek neo-Platonist philosophy and Eastern mythological ideas: Tertullian claims that Valentine was a Platonist who had found his weird ideas in Greek philosophy. Valentine believed that the material world was created by an evil Demiurge who had nothing to do with the Trinity. Men themselves are a mixture of good spirit and evil matter, and as a result God sent Christ to lead men out of the world of darkness towards Gnosis or spiritual knowledge. As Stephen realises, Valentine believed that Christ never had a material or terrene body and that he passed through his mother in Tertullian's words "like water through a pipe."

Whereas Valentine and other gnostic christians deified Christ to the point of denying his human qualities, Sabellius in the beginning of the third century developed an alternative theology that again we only know second-hand because, as in the case of Valentine, none of his writings have survived. According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Sabellius' view of the Trinity was not that far removed from the orthodox position of Tertullian. Sabellius, like many christians before and after him, attempted to rescue the concept Trinity from the charge of polytheism, by stressing the unity or monarchy of the One God, which is why his theology is generally called "monarchian." In his view the Trinity had but one hypostasis or substance, and this is, as the *Catholic Encyclopedia* puts it,

so far as words go, exactly the famous formulation of Tertullian, “tres personae, una substantia” (three persons, one substance), but Sabellius seems to have meant “three modes or characters of one person.”

It is this insistence on the unity of God, in keeping with Old Testament monotheism, that made Sabellius a heretic for orthodox thinkers: for him, Father, Son and Holy Ghost were no more than different names for the same God, and according to the historian of christian doctrine Jaroslav Pelikan, he is said to have called the Divinity “Sonfather.”³ The precise nature of Christ and the other Persons of the Trinity would continue to haunt christianity, and it ceased being a purely theological discussion when the Emperor Constantine adopted christianity: trinitarian theology had become a vital political issue.

In this context the case of Arius as a heresiarch is the clearest: in a way he became the arch-heresiarch, and his differing opinion about the exact relationship between the Father and the Son in the Trinity made it necessary for the first christian emperor to force the leaders of the church to decide the issue once and for all. According to the traditional view of the controversy in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Arius simply attacked the orthodox position which claimed that Jesus as the Son of God was fully divine and fully part of the Godhead. The *Encyclopedia* calls arianism “an Eastern attempt to rationalize the creed by stripping it of mystery so far as the relation of Christ to God was concerned.” In reality Arius and others like him based their thinking on the Gospels and the Epistles, where the humanity of Jesus as a suffering human is stressed and where it is made quite clear that Jesus is clearly subordinate to his Father.⁴ This view was shared by more than a few of the early church fathers like Justin Martyr, Clement and Origen, and it has even been claimed that this interpretation *was* orthodox until the defeat of arianism at the Council of Nicea. Contrary to what loyal church historians have claimed, the fateful choice against arianism was the result of a political need for doctrinal unity, and it had little if anything at all to do with theology. Even its importance has been exaggerated in later years: the Creed seems not to have been taken seriously by anyone, and ten years later most of its supporters had been deposed or even exiled from their local sees. In fact, in the following years Arius himself was not only exonerated, as were the two bishops who had refused to sign the Creed and had been anathematised: they too were returned to their sees. Arius’s main opponent in his local church of Alexandria was banished to Gaul. At the

end of his life the Emperor Constantine himself chose to be baptised by an arian bishop, and if more than half a century later another generation of anti-arians had not convinced another Roman emperor, the Council of Constantinople would not have repeated its attacks and arianism might well have become the official doctrine of the church of Rome. The Goths were arians, and the last remains of this most powerful of heresies only disappeared in the ninth century.

According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, the chronologically last heretic in Stephen's list, the patriarch Photius, is considered "one of its worst enemies" by the church because he is thought to have been responsible for the major schism in the ninth century between the Roman and the Byzantine churches. Despite the background to the controversy, which again centered on political differences between Rome and Constantinople, the Trinity was again a central issue in the dispute. The relationship between the three Persons of the Trinity had been finally defined in the Creed of the Council of Constantinople of 381. The arian king of Spain Reccared had converted from arianism to the orthodox faith, and the local Synod at Toledo in 589 had added the phrase "filioque" (and from the son) to the text of the Nicene Creed in an attempt to make the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity, proceed from both Father *and Son*, and thus to strengthen the Creed's anti-arian stance. Again, this was mainly a political decision, and somewhat later it was another worldly leader who forced the issue: in 809 in Aix-la-Chapelle, a council convened by Charlemagne accepted the alteration in the text. When explicitly asked by the Emperor, Pope Leo III accepted the new doctrine, but he refused to alter the text of the Creed.

Photius of Constantinople is called by the *Catholic Encyclopedia* "one of the most famous scholars of all the Middle Ages," and in 857 after the deposition of Ignatius, the reigning patriarch, Photius, who was a layman, became the patriarch of Constantinople. When the Pope in Rome not only refused to confirm the new appointment, but reinstated his predecessor and excommunicated Photius, the foundation for the most important schism in the history of the church was laid. Although there had been difficulties between the Eastern and Western churches before (the second iconoclast persecution in Byzantium had only recently been solved), and despite the fact that there had been theological and ritual differences, in principle Constantinople accepted the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. The Pope's refusal to accept the appointment of Photius brought things to a head; the two legates who had accepted the new patriarch were excommunicated, and the new patriarch was threatened with the same fate if he did not resign.

In 867 Photius in his turn excommunicated the Pope and the whole Latin church for five reasons that all had to do with liturgical differences, except the last one, which was the addition of the word “filioque” to the creed. The other four differences were minor, but the quarrel about the addition of “filioque” was a crucial point in which, again, the supposed heretic Photius was quite correct and the orthodox church of Rome was wrong: as most people concerned realised very well, the case of the Roman hierarchy was based on forged documents. In Byzantium, Photius fell out of favour for a while, but he was officially chosen as the successor of Ignatius and confirmed by Rome. In a special council that is accepted by the Eastern but not by the Western church, Photius revoked the decisions of the preceding council that had condemned him, he repeated his attacks on the Latins, he anathematised anybody who added anything to the creed, and he declared that the church in Bulgaria should belong to Constantinople (the latter point being the immediate political reason for the whole affair). When the acts of the Council were sent to Rome for confirmation, the Pope in his turn anathematised Photius again. In Constantinople Photius fell out of favour once more, and he was replaced as patriarch by the new emperor’s brother, an appointment that was not accepted by Rome. What happened to Photius is not clear, and there was a reconciliation between the Latin and the Greek church that lasted a century and a half, but the *Catholic Encyclopedia* still holds Photius responsible for “the schism which still lasts.”

Stephen calls Mulligan’s anti-christian jokes “idle mockery,” and he seems to believe that “the void” awaits those who dare to challenge the host of the archangel Michael. This rather pompous statement about a final victory of the church militant over the horde of heresies is ironically undercut by his own reaction: “Hear, hear! Prolonged applause. *Zut! Nom de Dieu!*” (*U* 1.665). In any case, Mulligan continues his mockery by crossing himself in priestly fashion when the still unidentified swimmer comes out of the water. It has already been pointed out that this might be a discreet reference to father Oliver Gogarty, hero of George Moore’s 1905 novel *The Lake*, who was named after Mulligan’s original, Oliver St John Gogarty. The fact that Stephen distances himself from Mulligan’s mockery does not mean that he is offended or that he takes the church’s side; Joyce only seems convinced that mockery is not the right weapon against religious belief.

In his discussions with Mr Deasy in the next chapter, the difference in their perceived religious allegiances seems insignificant compared to their political differences. The only explicit reference to religion is Stephen’s refusal to accept Deasy’s Hegelian idea that the goal of history

is the manifestation of God. In Proteus too, when all we have is Stephen's thought, God is almost completely absent: the few references to religion are all ironical. When Stephen picks up the theme of the Trinity, it is to describe his own relationship with his parents as "made not begotten," the exact opposite of the orthodox interpretation of Christ's consubstantiality with the Father. The reference to Thomas of Aquinas's *lex eterna* too is hardly to be taken seriously, although it touches on one of the paradoxes of the traditional views of God: if God is omnipotent, how can he himself be bound by the law that he has created? The reference to Arius's death (itself almost certainly a fabrication of his adversaries) is detailed but hardly relevant to the discussion, and the imagined voice of Stephen's real father is as rich in irreverent references to the Lord's name as that of Mulligan.

When he remembers reading "the fading prophecies of Joachim Abbas" in Marsh's library, he is reminded not so much of the pseudo-Joachim's apocalyptic prophecies but of Dean Swift's madness. The quotation from the papal prophecies (which happens to be its *incipit*) is in reality a variation because Joyce has replaced the original *ascende* (go up) with *descende* (come down), which he later repeats. This is a quite deliberate alteration because we know that originally, in the Rosenbach manuscript, Joyce still had the word *nimum* instead of *amplius*, so at some point he must have corrected part of the phrase. Although the Latin phrase has a very specific meaning in the pseudo-Joachimite and Franciscan prophecies, Gifford and Seidman are correct in also referring to the original of the first words in the Vulgate version of II Kings 2:23: "Ascende, calve; ascende, calve." This represents the taunting of the prophet Elijah by the children of Bethel who came out of the city and called out to him: "Go away, baldhead! Go away, baldhead!" The prophet "cursed them in the name of the Lord. Then two she-bears came out of the woods and mauled forty-two of the boys" (2:24). This example of the prophet's (or his Lord's) cruelty to children is a *locus classicus* for freethinkers and other sceptics: on the Web's "Holy Shit Index Page" the story was voted to the number one spot of the "Top Ten of Smitings." This status is confirmed in the apologetic literature which nearly always addresses this particular Bible difficulty.⁵

Whatever the accuracy of his prophecies, Joachim joins the company of equine faces which includes Mulligan and Temple. Mulligan the mocker is now associated with mental disorder and the threat of anathema which may remind the reader of the opening story in *Dubliners*. The description of Mass at the end of the paragraph has more echoes of Old Testament worship ("the altar's horns" and "the fat of kidneys of

wheat”) than of the catholic liturgy. The next couple of lines are among the more anti-clerical of the book, with “the snorted Latin of jackpriests” who are “tonsured and oiled and gelded” and who all celebrate Mass at different times in different places. About Occam it is said that “the imp hypostasis tickled his brain” (124), but what does this mean? The word “hypostasis” is a very ambiguous theological term, especially in the context of the trinitarian theology: in the case of Jesus it denotes his single essential personality as opposed to his two natures (divine and human); but in the case of the three Persons the word refers not to their common substance, but to their three different hypostases. The *OED* therefore posits “nature” as the antonym of the first and “substance” as that of the second meaning. Occam wrote a whole book on the sacrament of the Eucharist: the precise nature of Christ’s presence in bread and wine was of particular interest to the scholastic philosophers, who were divided on the question of whether the co-presence of Christ and bread/wine constituted an instance of consubstantiation or of transubstantiation. William of Occam’s position was not quite clear and seems to have shifted over the years, but despite the fact that he is generally thought to have opted for the latter option, which in the end became the orthodox position, his radical positions were often attacked as heretical, and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* mentions that he was often thought to have been the first protestant. From the context of Joyce’s comments it may be assumed that what he is referring to here is the problem of Christ’s *ubiquity*, a philosophical problem I remember bringing up in an admittedly more primitive form in my own early struggles with orthodox catholic doctrine: if the Catechism teaches that God is everywhere, what is the point of the consecration of bread and wine? Traditionally, the schools had distinguished among three concepts: the *omnipresence* of Christ’s divine nature, the *unipresence* that refers to his human nature in heaven and the *multipresence* of his body in the sacrament. For the inventor of Occam’s razor these were too many distinctions, and it may be thus in this sense that the medieval philosopher might have been tempted by the heretical “imp of hypostasis.”

In any case, these theological ideas lead to Stephen’s ironic reflections about his pious youth, which is immediately connected with women and sex: he prayed to the Blessed Virgin, he “prayed to the devil in Serpentine avenue that the fubsy widow in front might lift her clothes still more from the wet street,” and alone on the top of the Howth tram he cries to the rain: “*Naked women! Naked women!*” This leads to more reflections on his youthful follies until he realises that he won’t go and visit his aunt and heads instead towards the Pigeonhouse, which in its

turn brings on memories of Patrice Egan and the blasphemous *La Vie de Jésus* by Léo Taxil.

Léo Taxil or Gabriel-Antoine Jogand-Pagès was born in 1854 and educated by the Jesuits, but he lost his faith and he became one of the foremost propagandists of freethinking in France, publishing a number of anti-clerical periodicals that in 1876 forced him into a two year exile in Switzerland. On his return he founded the Anti-Clerical League, and he began to publish books with titles like *Les Maîtresses du Pape*, *Les Amours Secrètes de Pie IX*, *Le Manuel du Confesseur*. In 1882 his League had 4000 members in 27 groups all over Europe. After a brief adventure with Freemasonry, his business ventures failed and the “Librairie Anti-Cléricale” was forced to close down in 1884. After a very public reconversion to catholicism, Taxil began a vicious attack on his anti-clerical and masonic friends. In an atmosphere of strong conservative anti-masonic feeling, Taxil claimed to have evidence that the masons worshiped the devil. In the beginning Taxil’s contributions were welcomed by conservative catholics, who blamed a conspiracy of jews, masons and socialists for everything that went wrong in France. Taxil even had an audience with the Pope. But at the end of 1896 doubts began to be raised about some of his statements, and at a meeting in April 1897 Taxil announced that all his anti-masonic writings had been part of an elaborate hoax against the church. Despite this public admission, the stories about devil-worship can still be found on fundamentalist websites, who usually claim that it was Taxil’s retraction that was in fact the fraud: in the end, the devil worshipping masons had effectively managed to silence him.

Joyce’s Patrice Egan calls himself a socialist, and Taxil’s anti-clerical writings are exactly what a confessedly atheist young Frenchman at the turn of the century would be reading and recommending to others. The reference to the Ballad of Joking Jesus also shows the link with Mulligan’s blasphemies. When Stephen continues his walk on the beach, it is only when the little poem about gypsies mentions sex that Stephen is briefly reminded of Aquinas’s term “morose delectation,” just as somewhat later the sound of seawater among the weeds reminds him of a Latin phrase of Saint Ambrose. The final religious reference is typically an ambiguous quotation from the Easter vigil service: the “Exsultet” refers to Jesus as the morning star, but Joyce refers to the fallen angel Lucifer, the “proud lightning of the intellect” (*U* 3.486).

On the basis of the first three chapters of the novel, we can see the great continuity of this Stephen and the young hero of Joyce’s previous novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. This is certainly true for

his opinions on religion, despite the fact that the more outspoken criticism of the church or of religious belief in *Ulysses* is given to Mulligan and Patrice Egan. Stephen's intellectual frame of reference might be broadly described as catholic and even medieval-scholastic, but these intellectual building blocks are used for purely secular purposes, and in his *monologue intérieur* the frequent references to the Bible are all ironic. Something similar happens when we briefly glimpse Stephen in chapter 7, and it is no different when after a long interruption we meet him again in chapter 9.

In "Scylla and Charybdis" we have Stephen in full stride: sharp and erudite in the way he holds his ground against the Dublin intellectuals, but also ironic and self-critical in the silent comments that accompany his public performance. At the beginning of the chapter we get closest to Stephen's own philosophical opinions when he makes fun of the naive neo-Platonism of AE's theosophy or when he opposes to it Aristotle's "dagger definitions": "Hold on to the now, the here, through which all future plunges to the past" (*U* 9.89). But it is only when he reaches the first climax of his Shakespeare theory ("the son consubstantial with the father") that Stephen's many earlier references to the Trinity come together. Stephen expresses his theory about the biographical relevance of *Hamlet* in terms borrowed from the orthodox view of the relationship between Father and Son in the Trinity as expressed in the Creed. This is recognised by Mulligan, who only now enters the room and responds immediately with "Amen" and the ironic but formal question: "You were speaking of the gaseous vertebrate, if I mistake not?" Gifford and Seidman give for the phrase simply the annotation "Having a spine but without substance, a ghost"; in this case, "the son consubstantial with the father." This does not make much sense, and in a similar vein we might ask what has happened to the Holy Ghost, as the third and missing person of the Trinity. In reality, as Harald Beck and I discovered almost simultaneously, the expression "gaseous vertebrate" is a phrase that is ironically used to refer to God.

It was used by Ernst Haeckel in his *Die Welträthsel* of 1899, published the next year in London and New York as *The Riddle of the Universe*. In the first section, *Theism*, in chapter XV, which is dedicated to "God and the World," and before moving on to a discussion of pantheism, Haeckel discusses the different kinds of theism, only to end with the "personal anthropism" of God in which God assumes the form of a vertebrate (human or animal). In the more abstract forms of religion God becomes pure spirit:

Nevertheless, the psychic activity of this “pure spirit” remains just the same as that of the anthropomorphic God. In reality, even this immaterial spirit is not conceived to be incorporeal, but merely invisible, gaseous. We thus arrive at the paradoxical conception of God as a *gaseous vertebrate*.⁶

As the British biologist J. B. S. Haldane found out, reading Ernst Haeckel continued to be a dangerous pastime in the next century: in 1908 he was almost “sent down” from Eton when he was caught with a copy of *The Riddle of the Universe* and other books published by the Rationalist Press Association, despite the fact that the phrase and the concept was common enough to occur in the first lecture of William James's *Pragmatism* of 1907 and even in Jack London's 1908 novel *The Iron Heel*. Haeckel's book had been published in 1900, and the phrase must have functioned like a shibboleth for young freethinkers out to shock their elders, so that it is quite probable that a young medical student was using it four years later in Dublin and that he expected to be understood. Stephen's silent reaction to the intrusion is nothing if not hostile. The phrase about the “brood of mockers” is repeated, and the German proverb about ending up serving that which you have ridiculed conclusively spells out Stephen's problems with Mulligan's irreverence. By refusing to take religion seriously, he runs the risk of underestimating both its power and his own strength in distancing himself from it. But now the brood of mockers is a different set than in the first chapter:

Brood of mockers: Photius, pseudo Malachi, Johann Most.

He Who Himself begot middler the Holy Ghost and Himself sent Himself, Agenbuyer, between Himself and others, Who, put upon by His fiends, stripped and whipped, was nailed like bat to barndoor, starved on crosstree, Who let Him bury, stood up, harrowed hell, fared into heaven and there these nineteen hundred years sitteth on the right hand of His Own Self but yet shall come in the latter day to doom the quick and dead when all the quick shall be dead already. (U 9.493-9)

Let us look at this passage more closely. Photius was explained earlier in this essay, the second mocker might refer to Mulligan as Gifford and Seidman claim, but the addition of “pseudo” is puzzling. There are at least two likely candidates. The most famous pseudo-Malachi is the author of the series of prophecies ascribed to the eleventh century Irish bishop of that name. These prophecies, which were only

discovered five centuries after the Saint's death, consist of a list of names with a brief description of all the 112 Popes after Celestine II (who was elected in 1130). The list ends with Petrus Romanus, who will witness the destruction of the world and the final judgment. This particular set of prophecies is quite important in catholicism: in the discussion of prophecies in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, it is the second to be discussed and recently all over the world the election of Benedictus XVI was seen as a final confirmation that the end is nigh: our present Pope ("the glory of the olive," according to pseudo-Malachi) is the last Pope before Peter the Roman. It might be interesting to point out that the order of Benedictines have traditionally claimed that the penultimate Pope would come from their ranks, since they are commonly known as "olivetans." Cardinal Ratzinger was not a Benedictine, but he did say in 1997 that the Benedictines were the saviours of Europe, and he did assume the name Benedictus XVI.

As late as 1969 Colin Smythe in London published a translation of the prophecies introduced by a tongue-in-cheek letter from the archbishop H. E. Cardinale, who was Apostolic Nuncio to Belgium and Luxembourg and "until recently Apostolic Delegate to Great Britain." Both the *Catholic Encyclopedia* and most sane catholics have known for a long time that the prophecies of Malachi are a pious forgery of the sixteenth century and have nothing to do with the medieval Irish Saint.

If we exclude King Malachi, who "wore the collar of gold" in Thomas Moore's vision of a Celtic Ireland, another candidate is biblical. Malachi or Malachias is the author of the last book in the christian redaction of the jewish Bible, the twelfth of the Minor Prophets, who is named in the first verse or title of that short book: "The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi." The *Catholic Encyclopedia* notes that the Greek translators of the jewish Bible did not interpret the Hebrew word as a name, and they translated the verse as "the burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by the hand of his Angel," reading the name (which does not occur anywhere else in the Bible) as a Hebrew word that can mean both angel and messenger. Modern scholars now believe that a series of anonymous oracles and prophecies was divided at this point to create *twelve* divisions in the original scroll, representing the twelve tribes of Israel. In that sense there was never a person called Malachi.

If Malachi is an Old Testament prophet and Photius a ninth century schismatic, Johann Most was a German-American political activist who was still alive in 1904. The information about his person in Gifford and Seidman is correct for the most part, but the blasphemous creed that

immediately follows the reference to his name was part of an article published in Most's newspaper *Die Freiheit* and later as a separate pamphlet. The text's first English translation dates from 1888, and in Trieste and Zurich Joyce may have read it in the original, but also in French or Italian translations. The booklet continues to be published all over the world, and I have used an edition published by an anarchist "Artists' Group" in Frankfurt in 1996.

Rather ungrammatically, the translation of Most's book opens with the following statement: "Among all mental diseases that have been systematically inoculated the human cranium, the religious pest is the most abominable." The book goes on to chart the different aspects of the christian idea: the creation of the world; Mary's pregnancy and the Holy Ghost (in terms no less ironic than Taxil's); providence and a whole list of "unanswerable questions" about God which closes the book and that deserves to be quoted, since it is here that we find the original of Stephen's atheist creed.

The god of the Christians, as we have seen, is the god who makes promises only to break them; who sends them pestilence and disease in order to heal them; a god who demoralizes mankind in order to improve it. A god who created man "after his own image", and still the origin of evil in man is not accredited to him. This is a god who saw that all his works were good, and soon after discovered that they were bad; who knew that man would eat of the forbidden fruit, and still damned him eternally therefor. He is a god who is so dull as to allow himself to be outwitted by the Devil; so cruel that no tyrant on earth can be compared with him—that is the god of the Judaeo-Christian theology. He is an all-wise bungler who created mankind perfectly, but could not keep them in that state; who created the devil, yet could not keep him under control; a god who is omnipresent, yet descended from Heaven to see what mankind was doing; who is merciful, and yet has, at times, permitted the slaughter of millions. An Almighty who damned millions of innocent for the faults of a few; who caused the deluge to destroy mankind excepting a very few with whom to start a new generation no better than the preceding; who created a Heaven for the fools who believe in the "gospel" and a Hell for the enlightened who repudiate it. *A divine charlatan who created himself through the Holy Ghost, and then sent himself as mediator between himself and others, and who, held in contempt and derided by his enemies, was nailed to a cross, like a bat to a barndoor; who was buried,*

arose from the dead, descended to Hell, ascended to Heaven, and since then for eighteen-hundred years has been sitting at his own right hand to judge the living and the dead when the living cease to exist. A terrible despot, one whose history should be written in letters of blood, because it is a religion of terror [my italics].

As is clear from the italicised passage and from its German original, Most follows closely the wording of the creed, and so does Joyce. But Joyce's version differs from the very beginning: he does not include the "divine charlatan" of Most's version, and Joyce adds the capital letters that are absent in the original German. It is clear that the word "middler" in Joyce's version stands for "by means of," but it is less certain why Joyce attempted to mimic the German construction that was duly taken over by his German translators: in Goyert's version we find the translation "Er Der Sich Selbst erzeugte, Mittler zwischen Sich Selbst und anderen." Maybe Joyce wanted to create a suitably archaic diction that would be in the same vein as the word "agenbuyer" that he introduced in Most's text? Joyce varies on the English and German versions of Most's original by rhyming "stripped and whipped" and by moving the "like bat to barndoor" to the front. The phrase "starved on crosstree" contains another Germanism: the German verb "sterben" is a synonym of the general word for "to die," and "crosstree," despite its presence at the end of "Proteus," makes more sense as a literal German translation as "Kreuzholz." In the next sentence we find "stood up" as a literal equivalent for the German "auferstand," and "fared into heaven" refers to the German verb for "fuhr," the past tense of the verb *fahren*. When we now compare the original and Joyce's version it is reasonably clear that Joyce must have had the German original of Most's text before him and that he wilfully wanted his version to echo the German: he gives "fiends" for "Feinden" (enemies), and "he let him bury" closely follows "der sich begraben ließ." The effect of the blasphemy is certainly one of mockery, as is the Gregorian intoning of the *Gloria* that immediately follows it and that ties in with Buck Mulligan's earlier parody of the Mass.

Mulligan's irreverence about religions of all sorts is evident somewhat later when he recalls seeing Bloom in the National Museum:

—Jehovah, collector of prepuces, is no more. I found him over in the museum where I went to hail the foamborn Aphrodite. The Greek mouth that has never been twisted in prayer. Every day we must do homage to her. *Life of life, thy lips enkindle.*

Suddenly he turned to Stephen:

—He knows you. He knows your old fellow. O, I fear me, he is
Greeker than the Greeks. His pale Galilean eyes were upon her
mesial groove. Venus Kallipyge. O, the thunder of those loins!
The god pursuing the maiden hid. (U 9.609-17)

In orthodox Nietzschean fashion, Mulligan defines himself as a Greek, in opposition to the weak Hebrew and christian ideas. The quotes from Shelley and Swinburne strengthen the aesthetic dimension of his anti-christian stance, with its pagan reverence for nature, beauty and life. The “pale Galilean eyes” are especially revealing because this quote from Swinburne’s “Hymn to Proserpine” (“Thou has conquered, O pale Galilean; the world has grown grey from thy breath”) is the mid-Victorian variant of the Enlightenment commonplace about a superior Greco-Roman world desacralised and destroyed by judeo-christian repression. The reference to Emperor Julian’s supposed last words, “Vicisti, Galilæe” (You have won, Galilean), strenghtens this link with what had become a freethought cliché in the final half of the nineteenth century: Ibsen’s 1870 play *Emperor and Galilean* deals with the same conflict.

While Gogarty makes fun of Stephen’s recourse to Saint Thomas by adopting first his priestly role (“*Ora pro nobis*”) and then his stage Irishwoman’s voice (“*Pogue mahone! Acushla machree! It’s destroyed we are from this day! It’s destroyed we are surely!*”), Stephen goes ahead in developing his argument, which centers on a crucial difference between jews and christians, both groups described from the outside, an attitude that is also evident in the fact that he refers to the divinity using Blake’s name for the angry and jealous godhead.

It is only when Stephen turns his attention to fatherhood that the relevance of the earlier references to the *filioque* controversy become clear: “Fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting, is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate, an apostolic succession, from only begetter to only begotten” (U 9.837-42). If paternity is an apostolic succession, it really does represent a mystical estate which is, in its own estimate, the crucial difference between the church of Rome and its religious rivals. But Stephen is more concerned here with the relationship between the first two persons of the Trinity, and this is where Sabellius’s formulation about the father being his own son suddenly becomes relevant to his Shakespeare argument. It is only when Stephen’s “absurd name” is mentioned briefly that his memories turn to his Paris adventures, and at this point he quotes Christ’s (and Icarus’s) dying words to his father

(“Pater, ait”), and just a little later he offhandedly reverses Jesus’ phrase on the poor being always with us.

The Shakespeare references now turn to the “strong inclination to evil” that Stephen observes in the playwright and that is described with a phrase from the Catechism’s definition of the results of original sin, not the version quoted by Gifford and Seidman, which does not contain the phrase “a strong inclination to evil”:

Q. What other effects followed from the sin of our first parents?

A. Our nature was corrupted by the sin of our first parents, which darkened our understanding, weakened our will, and left in us a strong inclination to evil and rebellion.

In this context the elision of “and rebellion” is especially significant, and what is important here is that Shakespeare is described as an anti-type of Christ, a reversal we even find in the variation on “The Song of Old Ned,” where “good niggers” become “bad niggers.”

Stephen’s theory not only ends with the playwright’s death, but also moves out towards a formulation of what can only be called a general theology:

The playwright who wrote the folio of this world and wrote it badly (He gave us light first and the sun two days later), the lord of things as they are whom the most Roman of catholics call *dio boia*, hangman god, is doubtless all in all in all of us, ostler and butcher, and would be bawd and cuckold too but that in the economy of heaven, foretold by Hamlet, there are no more marriages, glorified man, an androgynous angel, being a wife unto himself. (*U* 9.1046-52)

Shakespeare had been compared with God before (in the quotation from Dumas *père*), but in another cliché from freethought literature (also used in the famous Scopes trial) the divinity is accused of botching the creation. There is more to be said about *dio boia* than Gifford and Seidman imagine (“a common Roman expression for the force that frustrates human hopes and destinies”). In fact it is a very low curse which Joyce here adopts as the designation of his concept of the cruel god (if he exists) who delights in tormenting his creatures. We will meet the *dio boia* again soon enough.

Mulligan’s reaction to the finale of Stephen’s theory is typical: he cries *Eureka* (not accidentally Greek) and comments, “The Lord has

spoken to Malachi,” which is after all only appropriate: we already know that “Malachi” means “messenger of the Lord.” When John Eglington gently chides Stephen for not even believing in his own theory, this is Stephen’s reaction: “I believe, O Lord, help my unbelief. That is, help me to believe or help me to unbelieve? Who helps to believe? *Egomen*. Who to unbelieve? Other chap” (*U* 9.1078-80). Again we observe the generalising tendency where we quickly move from innocent remarks to existential statements. Here we begin with a variation on Mark 9:24 (“Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief”), which is immediately glossed in the following sentences, first by the obvious paradox of praying to God for help in believing in him, then by the different irony of praying in order *not* to believe. For the first the addressee is “*Egomen*,” for the second we should ask “the other chap.”

The first word is a bit of a mystery that has led to the most diverse interpretations. Gifford and Seidman first claim that in Greek it means “I on the one hand,” but then against all sense claim that “in context” this involves a pun on the magazine *The Egoist*, where most of the early chapters of *Ulysses* first appeared and which originally was called the *Freewoman*. This interpretation is not just unlikely but impossible in context (*Egomen* is clearly used as a singular), but it would be the only instance where Joyce allows himself this kind of reference, and it is difficult to imagine what Joyce was trying to achieve by it in this context. But Gifford and Seidman’s first reference, which also tends to be popular among Joyceans who want to make the link between Shakespeare and Stephen/Joyce a bit more obvious, is also mistaken. Probably there was a mix-up with the legitimate *Latin* word “*egomet*,” which does mean “I myself.” René Girard, who believes that Joyce (like Shakespeare and the authors of the Bible) has anticipated the French critic’s all-encompassing theory of mimetic desire, needs the word to mean “myself,” and he seems to think that it refers both to Stephen and to Joyce himself. Most recently, Richard Kearney has linked the word to “*egomism*,” which is described in the *OED* as an obsolete and archaic synonym of solipsism (*The New Arcadia Review* Volume 3 [2005]).

In reality the *OED* does list the word in Joyce’s spelling, and although it is described as “*rare*” and has only one citation from the mid-nineteenth century, it does exist in English, and it has an appropriately religious connotation: “a monastic functionary in the Greek church.” On another level we might well be reminded not of one of His servants but of the God who told Moses: “*Ego sum qui sum*.” It is obvious from the context that it is only God himself who can help us believe, and just as

obviously the “other chap” can only be his Opponent, the fallen Angel with whom Stephen sympathised.

Mulligan and Stephen leave the library and stay in character. Mulligan comments on the color of Stephen’s clothes that only “crows, priests and English coal” are black, and when he berates his friend for not being more diplomatical, he calls him an “inquisitional drunken jewjesuit.” The chapter’s ending is, despite the brief passage of “the wandering jew,” almost exclusively pagan, with the references to augury, the neo-classical setting of the Library’s portico, and the last words of the chapter to the hierophantic druid priests of Cymbeline. It is probably no coincidence that from this pagan ending we move in the next chapter straight into the quite unpagan mind of the very reverend John Conmee, S. J.

When next we meet Stephen he is talking to Almidano Artifoni, and although we are not told what he has been telling the *maestro*, at least it is clear that it involves the fact that “*il mondo è una bestia*.” In the next section centered on him, Stephen is looking into a lapidary’s window, and the stones evoke primeval horrors: “Born all in the dark wormy earth, cold specks of fire, evil, lights shining in the darkness. Where fallen archangels flung the stars of their brows. Muddy swinesnouts, hands, root and root, gripe and wrest them” (*U* 10.805-7). The last part of the first sentence contains a probably polytheistic reference to the prologue of the Fourth Gospel: “And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.” This is a sort of hell that as Stephen knows quite well is of his own creation, but that awareness does not stop him from turning over these dark thoughts until he manages to interest himself in his immediate surroundings. On the huckster’s bookcart he finds a sorcery book that promises him a magical recipe to win a woman’s love, but reality intrudes in the form of his sister Dilly. Although he has the money and tells himself to save her, he is afraid that she will “drown me with her,” and even the repetition of “agenbite of inwit” cannot make him change his mind. Stephen’s moroseness seems to be confirmed in a later section when Mulligan is talking about Stephen with Haines in the DBC. He analyses his friend: “They drove his wits astray, he said, by visions of hell. He will never capture the Attic note. The note of Swinburne, of all poets, the white death and the ruddy birth” (*U* 10.1073-75). Again in Gibbon-Nietzschean fashion, Mulligan opposes Greek paganism to judeo-christian slavery.

This aspect of Stephen shines through the distortions in “Oxen of the Sun,” as when Stephen is said to have “mean of a frere,” and when he joins the discussion most of his comments are of a similar kind. When he

drunkenly proposes a toast to the Pope he turns it into a Mulliganesque parody of the Eucharist, which quickly evolves into a drunken exegesis of Blake's apocalyptic "time's ruins build eternity's mansions". It is certainly not clear to what degree we are supposed to take this secular homily seriously, but we cannot deny that Stephen is quite as ambitious and eclectic in his references as in "Scylla and Charybdis." What he seems to be doing is to compare female and male creation in terms of the incarnation of Jesus. The question is, if Mary recognised Jesus for what he was from the moment he was born, then she was indeed what Saint Bernard, through Dante, makes of her "creature of her creature," daughter of her son. But if she didn't, she is no better than Peter, the first Pope, who denied Christ. And it could all be much worse if Léo Taxil is right. In that case, we would not even have transubstantiality or consubstantiality but something that can only be called "subsubstantiality." The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is therefore only for the lewd to worship (it is after all, as Stephen has claimed earlier, merely an Italian invention), and other believers must resist it: "With will will we withstand, withsay" (*U* 14.311-12). In reaction to these theological ruminations, Dixon asks Stephen why he did not become a friar, and the latter answers him by inverting the three traditional vows: he will be obedient in the womb, chaste in the tomb and his poverty will be involuntary in between. When accused by Lenahan of the corruption of minors, he denies the accusation and claims that he is, like Christ, "the eternal son and ever virgin." Stephen becomes ever drunker, and his comments become more and more a mixture of phrases with little connection between them. But what we can make out suggests that he seems to have adopted the guise of the biblical god admonishing Erin-Israel for being unfaithful to him.

When there is thunder and it begins to rain, Lynch claims that "the god self was angered for his hellprate and paganry" (*U* 14.411-12), and Stephen's fearful reaction does not seem to indicate that he doesn't agree. In the style of Bunyan, Stephen as "Boasthard" now explains his loss of faith as the result of "Carnal Concupiscence." Although Stephen occasionally makes his appearance (mostly as a priest or a monk), it is when the style of Thomas Huxley takes over the narrative that on the one hand he is accused of being addicted to "perverted transcendentalism," whereas on the other he seems to hold a degree of "Doubter of Divinity" (*Divinitatis Scepticus*). Stephen repeats his opinion about the *dio boia*, whom he calls "an omnivorous being" and about whom he offers the opinion that if the divinity is prepared to feast on cancrenous females like his mother, the deity might also like to devour an occasional child.⁷ It is

interesting to see that the Huxley narrator takes Bloom's more humane side against the "morbidminded esthete and embryo philosopher" Stephen. The end of the chapter is pure linguistic chaos, with many different voices, idiolects, and languages, yet in the last section something like Stephen's voice seems to take over in what Blamires calls "the vulgarest button-holing commercialese" (165). Yet there is much more in the last paragraph, for instance quotations from both Old and New Testaments. When Lynch asks Stephen about Bloom, he is told: "Sinned against the light and even now that day is at hand when he shall come to judge the world by fire" (*U* 14.1575-77). Despite the clear biblical echoes in this sentence ("even now," "is at hand," "to judge the world by fire"; none of these expressions is strictly biblical, although all of them were and are frequently used by preachers of all denominations. "To judge the world by fire" is part of the "Office for the dead" and the burial ceremonies of both the anglican and the catholic church; it is often used in *Requiems* (including Fauré's and Verdi's). In other words, the sentence sounds biblical, but isn't. That may be why, after a rude noise ("Pflaap"), we read a phrase often used in the Gospels, "*Ut implerentur scripturae,*" that the Scriptures might be fulfilled; it is as if Stephen is making the surely ironical point, *contra* Deasy, that the latter's protestant anti-Semitism lacks a suitably biblical basis. An announcement of another protestant preacher, Alexander J. Dowie, forms the basis of some of these comments. John Alexander Dowie was an evangelical faith healer with his own church, the Christian Catholic Apostolic Church, in his own Zion City, Illinois. One of his greatest successes was the miraculous healing of the niece of Buffalo Bill, whom he cured of spinal cancer. Dowie also fulminated against the use of pharmaceutical medicine and pork products and against members of secret societies such as the Freemasons, corrupt politicians and liberal clergymen. Politically, he saw himself as a Theocrat and a follower of the British Israelites, who believed that the Northern peoples were the direct descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel (etymologically, the Saxons were "Isaac's sons," and the Danes the sons of Dan). In June 1901 Dowie proclaimed himself the prophet Elijah (and he began to dress the part), but only five years later he was accused of fraud and polygamy and deposed as leader of his church. In the rest of the paragraph, Dowie's preaching is therefore wide of the mark: Dowie was not so much a revivalist christian (although he is claimed by some contemporary christian fundamentalists) as a founder of his own religion: in that sense he has much more in common with Joseph Smith of the Mormon church than with revivalists like Torrey and Alexander. But it remains interesting that Joyce decided to end his

chapter on the development both of an embryo and of English prose style with this particular kind of American language, with its rich mixture of the vulgar and the elevated, the holy and the profane.

From his first appearance in "Circe," Stephen is hailed as a parson, and drunkenly he "chants with joy the *introit* for paschal time" (*U* 15.73-75). In a sense he seems to have taken over the absent Mulligan's priestly role, but soon enough it becomes evident that the chanting is but an interruption in the middle of an argument about the merits of gesture as a more primitive and thus universal language. When he needs to provide another example, again he refers to the most loaded symbols in christianity, the wine and bread of the Eucharist, but refers to them as "the loaf and jug of bread or wine in Omar" (*U* 15.117). When he answers Lynch's questions about which brothel they'll go to, Stephen in his answer feminises Mulligan's quote from the beginning of the Mass: "*ad deam qui laetificat juventutem meam*" (*U* 15.122-23).

When we rediscover Stephen in the brothel, he is pontificating on music in a speech that repeatedly mixes and confuses biblical and Greek or Roman references. It is certainly ironic that when he is challenged by Lynch to finish his exposé on the return of the self to the self, he is disturbed by what he calls "that fellow's noise in the street" (*U* 15.2119-20). This is not just his earlier definition of God in his discussion with Mr. Deasy, but here it refers to the gramophone outside that is blaring the christian hymn "The Holy City," a more recent version (1892) of the biblical psalms he has been discussing. Although they are suitably impressed with Stephen's learning, the three prostitutes change the subject to the Last Coming:

FLORRY

They say the last day is coming this summer.

KITTY

No!

ZOE

(*Explodes in laughter.*) Great unjust God!

FLORRY

(*Offended.*) Well, it was in the papers about Antichrist. O, my foot's tickling.

(*Ragged barefoot newsboys, jogging a wagtail kite, patter past, yelling.*)

THE NEWSBOYS

Stop press edition. Result of the rockinghorse races. Sea serpent in the royal canal. Safe arrival of Antichrist. (*U* 15.2129-41)

At this, according to the stage directions, Stephen turns and sees Bloom. His reply shows that he knows his Bible, because he quotes Rev. 12:14, which immediately follows the reference to “that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world” (Rev. 12:9). The figure of Reuben J Antichrist appears with on the hook of a boatpole “his only son” and accompanied by Punch Costello, who performs the part of the creator-god, juggling planets. With “The Holy City” still blaring in the background, first a personified Bosch-like “End of the World” appears, and it is followed by Elijah in the person of Alexander J. Dowie. This is only appropriate: American freethinkers called Dowie “Elijah II.”⁸ The decidedly American evangelist repudiates Darwin and commands the whores and their clients to realise their spiritual potential because it will allow them to “rub shoulders with a Jesus, a Gautama, and Ingersoll” (*U* 15.2199), forgetting momentarily that Robert Ingersoll (1833-99) was the foremost American freethinker and as such one of Dowie’s chief antagonists. The evangelist even complained at one point that Ingersoll and other skeptics refused to believe the miracles attested in the Bible without bothering to investigate the evangelical miracles happening all around them. Dowie is not entirely correct: like the theosophists he seems to appreciate Gautama and he refers to “the harmonial philosophy” (*U* 15.2205). This was one of the first spiritualist doctrines, developed by Andrew Jackson Davis (1826-1910), who has been called “the Saint John the Baptist of Spiritualism.” With a bit of help from “Mr President” Elijah, now in black minstrel outfit, he attempts to convert the three prostitutes, although the Almighty refuses to interfere: “Our Mr President, he twig the whole lot and he aint saying nothing.” When the prostitutes confess their sexual sins, Stephen briefly resumes his role as priest with an appropriate quotation from the first verse of the Gospel of John and the end of the *Gloria Patri*, but then Lyster, Best and Eglinton appear, followed by Mananaun MacLir, who

speaks the root language of hermeticism and of the theosophy that AE had described in his book *The Candle of Vision*.

After an interruption Stephen is still quoting Scripture, but he has other things on his mind now, mostly music and Deasy's letter, but the conversation turns to religion again when Stephen tells Zoe that she would have preferred Luther, the fighting parson, although she is told to beware of "Antisthenes, the dog sage, and the last end of Arius Heresiarchus" (*U* 15.1642-43). When Florry claims that he is a "spoiled priest" and Lynch counters that he's a "cardinal's son," Stephen's father appears in a cardinal's clothes, and after a parody of the Easter kiss he sings the song Parnell and Kitty O'Shea preferred in the early years of their love. His Irish sentimentalism echoes that of Simon Dedalus: "By the hoky fiddle, thanks be to Jesus those funny little chaps are not unanimous. If they were they'd walk me off the face of the bloody globe" (*U* 15.2679-81). When invited by Zoe for "some parleyvoo," it is interesting to see that Stephen's breathless overview in broken English of Parisian *risqué* delights not only includes "lovely ladies" and "dancing cancan" but also an even more libertine Paris with black Masses: "Perfectly shocking terrific of religion's things mockery seen in universal world" (*U* 15.3890-91). It is interesting to note that for Stephen Dedalus the language of blasphemy tends towards the condition of French.

Suddenly Stephen is reminded of his dream, and he seems to recognise that there is a connection between the dream and his present circumstances, but this is linked with an earlier memory of praying to the devil that a "fubsy widow" would lift her skirts. When Bloom tries to calm him down, Stephen is reminded of an earlier part of the dream that seems to be more consistent with his literary ambitions: "No, I flew. My foes beneath me. And ever shall be. World without end. (*he cries*) *Pater! Free!*" (*U* 15.3935-6). Carefully Joyce mixes different verbal memories of Stephen with the "Gloria Patri" and both Icarus's and Christ's last words on the cross that he referred to earlier in the day. Stephen becomes even more rebellious: "Break my spirit, will he? *O merde alors!*" It is clear that by flying he openly defies God; he even shows off "his vulture talons sharpened." He is the quarry of a hunt led by Mr. Deasy, but he puts himself in the position of the proud and defiant outcasts like Parnell or the hero of "The Holy Office" ("Firm as the mountain-ridges where / I flash my antlers on the air") and of *Stephen Hero*. The sharpened talons seem to have a function not dissimilar to the flashing antlers.

Stephen's thoughts are interrupted by the dancing, but when the music stops and everybody applauds, his father (in the Rosenbach manuscript it was originally Lynch) reminds him of his mother ("Think

of your mother's people!"), and this is the trigger for a litany of assorted memories of the past day—some of them Bloom's—when suddenly Stephen's mother rises "through the floor" while "uttering a silent word." In this climactic scene Stephen is confronted with the consequences of his atheism: he rejects the responsibility involved in the death of his mother ("Cancer did it, not I. Destiny"). When he wants to hear from his mother the "word known to all men," she links her own maternal love to prayer for the suffering souls in purgatory and accuses him of callousness and a refusal to return her love. Her calls for Stephen's repentance are met by Stephen's renewed defiance towards God: "His noncorrosive sublimate! The corpsechewer! Raw head and bloody bones." Stephen has argued in the previous chapter that, if there is a God, he is responsible for the death of all humans: corrosive sublimate is mercuric chloride, a powerful poison, and it is the image of God as the boogeyman who frightens children that Stephen is fighting against in this crucial scene. His mother now warns him with a "blackened withered right arm" raised towards Stephen's breast—"Beware God's hand!"—and "a green crab with malignant red eyes sticks deep its grinning claws in Stephen's heart" (*U* 15.2419-20). This is too much for Stephen: after calling out, "strangled with rage," his rejection is given voice in three different languages: "*Ah non, par exemple!* The intellectual imagination! With me all or not at all. *Non serviam!*" While the denial is expressed in the French language that to Stephen seems appropriate for freethinking but that his mother probably cannot understand, his reference to the intellectual imagination can signify either an appeal to his art against the religious onslaught or, dismissively, an ironic rejection of the lack of inspiration displayed in his hallucination. In any case, he concludes that his mother's love must not only be unconditional but cannot be linked to religious sensibilities. His *non serviam* links him to the great artists and heretics who inspired him to refuse, to use the terms at the end of *A Portrait*, to serve that in which he no longer believes. From that moment, his mother's prayers and references to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, even her deathrattle, have no more power over him, and with Wagner as his guide Stephen smashes the chandelier with his walking stick and brings the vision (together with all time and all space) to an apocalyptic end.

Even in the drunken brawl with the British soldiers outside in the street, Stephen manages to bring in religion when he mentions in passing, tapping his brow: "But in here it is I must kill the priest and the king" (*U* 15.4436-37). Private Carr seems only interested in the insult to his King, but when the latter finally does appear, he is wearing "a white jersey on which an image of the Sacred Heart is stitched" (*U* 15.5549-50). When

somewhat later Ireland itself appears in the shape of the Poor Old Woman, it is Stephen who dismisses her reliance on priests and religion. In words that echo the ballad "The Wearing of the Green," she asks him: "You met with poor old Ireland and how does she stand?" Stephen characteristically turns the final question around to put himself at centre stage, in opposition to the priest-ridden Ireland: "How do I stand you? The hat trick! Where's the third person of the Blessed Trinity? Soggarth Aroon? The reverend Carrion Crow" (*U* 15.4587-92). Theologically, what the drunken Stephen is trying to say is not as clear as Gifford and Seidman think. They believe the question about the third person of the Trinity must be decoded as "Where is the Church?" *Soggarth Aroon* certainly refers to the sentimental love of the Irish for their parish priests, which is met with the scornful "reverend Carrion Crow," a description of priests that was common in anti-clerical and freethinking literature from the second half of the nineteenth century and that was briefly referred to earlier by Mulligan at the end of chapter 9. In the following apocalyptic vision, the dead walk the streets of Dublin. In the centre of the earth, a field altar rises that is dedicated to Saint Barbara but that has distinctly satanic and jewish characteristics: there are black candles, horns and the altarstone is "smokepalled." The scene is partly based, of course, on an image in Stephen's morning musings on the beach in "Proteus." The goddess of unreason lies naked on it, with a chalice on her belly. Both the Irish churches are actively involved: the inverted Mass is celebrated by Father Malachi O'Flynn and the Reverend Hugh C. Haines Love, who appropriately speak in catholic Latin and anglican English. In the final confrontation with the British soldier, Stephen is told to sacrifice himself for his country by the female personification of Ireland, just as earlier his mother tried to break his spirit. It is interesting to see that in these trying moments Stephen's only recourse is not to the walking stick that Bloom offers him but to reason: "Stick, no. Reason. This feast of pure reason" (*U* 15.4735).

In the next chapter in the cabman's shelter, Bloom turns the conversation to metaphysics by asking if Stephen, who is considered to be a good catholic, believes in the existence of the soul. Stephen's answer is not straightforward but is theologically astute, after the fashion of Aquinas ("They tell me on the best authority," it begins), but Stephen clearly indicates his distance by his flippant manner of referring to the "First Cause Who, from all I can hear, is quite capable of adding [the annihilation of the soul] to the number of His other practical jokes" (*U* 16.756-9). When Bloom expresses doubt about the existence of "a supernatural God," Stephen again ironically counters that it "has been

proved conclusively by several of the bestknown passages in Holy Writ, apart from circumstantial evidence” (U 16.772-73).

In the “Ithaca” chapter it becomes more difficult to isolate references to religion, but the list of conversation topics of the two night wanderers in the second answer includes the following: “the Roman catholic church, ecclesiastical celibacy, the Irish nation, jesuit education,” and according to the following answer they now seem in agreement in their rejection of religion: “Both indurated by early domestic training and an inherited tenacity of heterodox resistance professed their disbelief in many orthodox religious, national, social and ethical doctrines” (U 17.15-25). Somewhat later, when the two compare Irish and Hebrew speech and script and after Bloom has chanted a traditional song, Stephen is reminded visually of the “traditional figure of hypostasis, depicted by Johannes Damascenus, Lentulus Romanus and Epiphanius Monachus as leucodermic, sesquipedalian with winedark hair.” The first and the third were Greek theologians who described the outward appearance of Jesus; Publius Lentulus was the supposed author of a report about Jesus to the Roman senate by Pontius Pilate’s predecessor, which was quoted by the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (the article needlessly points out that the text is a blatant forgery):

Lentulus, the Governor of the Jerusalemites to the Roman Senate and People, greetings. There has appeared in our times, and there still lives, a man of great power (virtue), called Jesus Christ. The people call him prophet of truth; his disciples, son of God. He raises the dead, and heals infirmities. He is a man of medium size (*statura procerus, mediocris et spectabilis*); he has a venerable aspect, and his beholders can both fear and love him. His hair is of the colour of the ripe hazel-nut, straight down to the ears, but below the ears wavy and curled, with a bluish and bright reflection, flowing over his shoulders. It is parted in two on the top of the head, after the pattern of the Nazarenes. His brow is smooth and very cheerful with a face without wrinkle or spot, embellished by a slightly reddish complexion. His nose and mouth are faultless. His beard is abundant, of the colour of his hair, not long, but divided at the chin. His aspect is simple and mature, his eyes are changeable and bright. He is terrible in his reprimands, sweet and amiable in his admonitions, cheerful without loss of gravity. He was never known to laugh, but often to weep. His stature is straight, his hands and arms beautiful to behold. His conversation is grave, infrequent, and modest. He is the most beautiful among the children of men.

For Stephen, in other words (or at least in words less sesquipedalian), Bloom resembles the traditional depiction of Jesus in the Greek church. The closest we get to a creed on Stephen's part is given as his reason for not being dejected, just before he is ready to leave Bloom's house: "He affirmed his significance as a conscious rational animal proceeding from the known to the unknown and a conscious rational reagent between a micro and a macrocosm ineluctably constructed upon the incertitude of the void" (*U* 17.1112-15). This could function as a description of a freethinker's philosophy.

The last of Stephen's thoughts we are given concern "the invisible audible collateral organ of the other" that he thinks of while urinating with Bloom in the garden. Stephen reflects on

the problem of sacerdotal integrity of Jesus circumcised (1 January, holiday of obligation to hear mass and abstain from unnecessary servile work) and the problem as to whether the divine prepuce, the carnal bridal ring of the holy Roman catholic apostolic church, conserved in Calcata, were deserving of the simple hyperduly or of the fourth degree of latria accorded to the obscission of such divine excrescences as hair and toenails. (*U* 17.1203-9)

Most of this passage comes from the series of notes taken from Müller's book on the divine foreskin mentioned earlier, and I have included the relevant passages of the book and a translation as an appendix.

Although many critics of *Ulysses* have attempted to find some kind of deeper spiritual significance in the final scene between Stephen and Bloom, the net outcome is only that without saying very much (although he seems to make the suggestion that he needs to urinate), the hero of *Stephen Hero, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and the greater part of the present novel, disappears into the night forever, leaving the scene to Mr. Leopold Bloom and his late-night musings.

Although it has been tried often enough, this essay has attempted to show that there seems to be no reason to reclaim Stephen Dedalus (or his creator) for catholicism or for any other religion. Naturally, like Joyce's own, Stephen's education and background were entirely catholic, but it is evident from the material presented here that one cannot identify him with the religion he so clearly and painfully rejects in *Ulysses*. Stephen's attitudes to those things in which he no longer believes, his home, his fatherland and his church, form a central theme in this as in Joyce's

GEERT LERNOUT

previous novel. *Ulysses* also describes Leopold Bloom's quite different relationship with religion. But that is another story.

Appendix

A selection of passages with their translation from Alphons Victor Müller's *Die 'hochheilige Vorhaut Christi' im Kult und in der Theologie der Papstkirche*, published in Berlin in 1907 by C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn. Italics and bold are in the original. Those words and phrases noted down by Joyce in the National Library notebook have been underlined. Most of the notes have been crossed out in red and were indeed used in this passage in "Ithaca."

Page 18: Ja bis ins XIX. Jahrhundert hinein haben der päpstliche oberste Bücherzensor in Rom und der Stellvertreter des Papstes für das Bistum Rom Bücher gutgeheissen, die sich die Förderung der Präputiumsandacht zum Zweck gesetzt hatten und noch heutzutage im XX. Jahrhundert wird mit Gutheissung der Päpste nicht 50 Kilometer von Rom ein Präputium in Calcata öffentlich in der Kirche verehrt.

Well into the nineteenth have the supreme papal book censor in Rome and the ambassador of the pope for the Roman see given permission to print books that wanted to advocate the adoration of the Holy Prepuce and even today in the twentieth century no more than fifty kilometers from Rome a prepuce is openly venerated in a church in Calcata, with permission of the pope.

Page 36: Ein anderes Licht der Gesellschaft Jesu, der hochgepriesene Salmeron, ging in seinem mystischen Dusel sogar so weit, dass er gleichfalls in seinem Evangelienkommentar das Praeputium als den Verlobungsring, den Christus an seine Braut schickt, bezeichnete!

Another great light of the Society of Jesus, the much-praised Salmeron, even went so far in his mystic visions that in his commentary on the gospel he described the prepuce as the engagement ring that Jesus sent to his betrothed!

Page 49: Ist das Praeputium notwendig “ad essere” und “bene essere” des auferstandenen Körpers? Gehört es zu seiner Integrität? Auf diese Frage antwortete eine Theologenschule: Nein! Das Praeputium gehört nicht zur Integrität des auferstandenen Körpers. Christus braucht mithin im Himmel kein Praeputium und besitzt auch tatsächlich diesen Teil nicht, sondern hat ihn auf der Erde zurückgelassen.

Is the prepuce necessary “ad essere” and “bene essere” of the resurrected body? Does it belong to its integrity? This question was answered by one school of theologians in the negative. The prepuce does not belong to the integrity of the resurrected body. In heaven Christ does not need a prepuce and indeed does not have that particular body part, because he has left it behind on earth.

Page 50: Das Praeputium gehört zur Integrität gewisser Menschen: Transeat. Es gehört zur Integrität des Juden: Nego: denn der Jude sah diesen Teil als “Exkrement” an. Christus ist aber ein Jude gewesen. Ergo, gehört dieser Teil nicht zu **seiner** Integrität.

The prepuce belongs to the integrity of certain people: Transeat. It belongs to the integrity of the jews: Nego: because the jew saw this part as “excrement.” Christ was a jew. Ergo, this part does not belong to his integrity.

Pages 53-55: Mit vielen anderen glaubte der Jesuit Raynaldus, Christus habe es sich aus irgend einer beliebigen Materia schaffen können. [...] Er verteidigte vielmehr der These, dass dieser wenn auch nebensächliche Teil zwar nicht aus *derselben*—da das Praeputium auf Erden gezeigt wurde—, wohl aber aus einer verwandten Materie, die früher irgend einem anderen Teil seines Körpers angehört hatte und von ihm ausgestossen worden war, geformt worden ist.

With many others the Jesuit Raynaldus believed that Christ had created it out of some material or other. Rather he defended the thesis that this rather superfluous part was made not really out of the same material, but out of a related material that had earlier belonged to another part of his body and that he had ejected.

Pages 55-56: Mit Erledigung dieser Frage war aber der Forschungstrieb dieser Gottesmänner noch lange nicht gestillt. Sie suchten daher zu ergründen **ob Christus in der Eucharistie ein Praeputium hat oder nicht**. Als nämlich die Eucharistie *eingesetzt* wurde, lebte Christus noch auf Erden und war noch nicht verstorben und auferstanden. Zu seinen *Lebzeiten* hatte er aber, das müssen alle Theologen zugeben, kein Praeputium. Als nun das Brot in den Leib Christi verwandelt wurde am Tage der Einsetzung des Abendmahl, konnte es nicht anders sein, als dass das Praeputium darin fehlte. [...] Seit der Auferstehung findet sich nämlich in der Eucharistie nicht der Körper Christi, wie er hier auf Erden *vor dem Tode des Herrn* beschaffen war, sondern der glorreiche Körper Christi mit allen Eigenschaften, die er jetzt im Himmel hat.

With the answer to this question the inquisitive drive of these men of God was not yet satisfied. They attempted to discover if Christ in the Eucharist had or did not have a prepuce. When the Eucharist was instituted, Christ was still alive on earth and not yet dead or resurrected. When the bread was transmuted into the body of Christ when the Eucharist was instituted, the prepuce could not but be absent in it. Since the resurrection we find in the Eucharist not the body of Christ as it was before the death of the Lord, but the glorified body of Christ with all the qualities that it has in heaven.

Page 56: Von noch grösserer Tragweite war folgende Streitfrage: *Ist die Gottheit mit dem Praeputium, das hier auf Erden zurückgeblieben ist, noch vereinigt?* **Muss infolgedessen das Praeputium angebetet werden oder genügt es, es zu verehren?**

Even more important was the next crucial question: Is the divinity still connected to the prepuce that was left behind here on earth?

Pages 58-59: Wenn nun auch auf diese Weise dem Praeputium die “Unio hypostatiöa” genommen wurde, so traten trotzdem angesehene Theologen für die Ansicht ein, dass ihm der “cultus laetiae” (der Anbetung), die Gott

allein gebührt, dennoch zu erweisen sei. So schreibt Bischof Angelo Rocca Sakristan Seiner Heiligkeit usw.: “Wenn auch jenes Häutchen zur Erbauung der Gläubigen auf der Erde zurückgelassen worden ist und dasselbe, wie die Theologen wollen, nicht als mit der Gottheit verbunden anzusehen ist, so muss es doch *als ehemaliger Teil des Körpers Christi, der immer mit der Gottheit vereint gewesen ist, und noch ist, durch “Latreia-Anbetung” angebetet werden und zwar nach dem vierten Modus der Latreia-Anbetung*”. Dieser “vierte Modus” erklärt, dass das Praeputium ebenso anzubeten sei als wie die Haare und Kleider Christi (tamquam aliquid ejus), insofern es ein Körperteil ist, der ihm einst angehört hat.

When in this way the “Unio hypostatiōa” was taken from the prepuce, there were important theologians who claimed that it deserved the “cultus latriae” (adoration), that belongs to God alone. The bishop Angelo Rocca, sacristan of his Holiness, etc., writes: “When even so small a piece of skin has been left behind on earth for the enlightenment of the believers and, as the theologians claim, it cannot but be considered as still connected with the divinity, then that former part of Christ’s body, that was always united with the divinity and still is, must be adored through the “Latreia-Adoration” and more specifically according to the fourth mode of Latreia-Adoration. This “fourth mode” means that the prepuce must be adored in the same way as the hair and clothes of Christ (tamquam aliquid ejus), insofar as it is a body part, that once belonged to him.

Pages 59-60: Angesichts dieser Bedeutung, die selbst die nachreformatorische Theologie unserer Reliquie geschenkt hat, erklärt es sich, dass diese Scholastiker auch über eine letzte Frage, die sie betrifft, Klarheit verbreiten wollten. **Was wird aus dem Praeputium werden nach dem Weltuntergang?** Die einen meinen, es werde sich allmählich in dem Körper Christi auflösen gleichwie Christus nach der Auferstehung, als er dem Verdauungsprozess nicht mehr unterworfen sein konnte, die von ihm eingenommenen Speisen sich assimiliert habe. Andere wiederum behaupten, da es nicht zur Integrität des Körpers gehöre, werde es eingäschert werden. Eine dritte vielvertretene Auffassung glaubt endlich, dass dieses kostbare Häutchen an irgend einem Ort des Himmels in saecula saeculorum aufbewahrt werden wird.

In terms of the significance that was accorded by post-reformation theology to our relic, it is not surprising that our scholastics also wanted to find an answer to a final question. What will happen to the prepuce after the end of the world? Some believe it will return to the body of Christ, like Christ himself after the resurrection when he was no longer subject to the process of life and the food in his stomach were assimilated in his body. Others claimed that since it did not belong to the integrity of his body, it had to be cremated. A third group believed finally that this valuable piece of skin would be kept in some part of heaven *in saecula saeculorum*.

Bibliography

- Blamires, Harry. *The Bloomsday Book: A Guide Through Joyce's 'Ulysses'*. London: University Paperbacks, 1966.
- Ferguson, Charles W. *The Confusion of Tongues: A Review of Modern Isms*. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co, 1928.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Trans. Georg Goyert. Berlin: Deutsche Buch-Gemeinschaft, 1966.
- Dowling, Levi H. *The Aquarian Gospel of Jesus the Christ: The Philosophic and Practical Basis of the Religion of the Aquarian Age of the World and of the Church Universal*. London: L. N. Fowler.
- MacDonald, George E.. *Fifty Years of Freethought: Being the Story of the Truth Seeker, with the Natural History of its Third*. New York: The Truth Seeker Company, 1929.
- Most, Johann. *Die Gottespest*. Frankfurt: AV'88, 1996.
- Müller, Alphons Victor. *Die 'hochheilige Vorhaut Christi' Im Kult and in der Theologie der Papstkirche*. Berlin: C.A. Schwetske und Sohn, 1907.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. Part 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- . *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. Part 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Notes

¹ Manuscript in James Joyce Series A. Box 1,4 of the Harry Ransom Center for the Humanities. I would like to take this occasion to gratefully acknowledge a grant from HRC to do research on this topic in March 2005.

² According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, in the middle of the fifteenth century the Italian philologist Lorenzo Valla was tried for heresy for having doubted that the text was really written by the twelve apostles.

³ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine: Volume 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 179.

⁴ For the role of Arianism in the Roman Empire see Charles Freeman in the relevant chapter of *The Closing of the Western Mind* (London: William Heinemann, 2002).

⁵ See, for example, Gleason L. Archer's *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982). Archer offers the classic excuse: these were not children but young hoodlums, like "the large youth gangs that roam the ghetto sections of our modern American cities." In apologetic literature they are usually referred to as "the lads of Bethel." Neither Archer nor any of the other apologists I have read point out the particular consolation the mothers of these lads must have derived from the fact that the agents of execution had been *female* bears.

⁶ Ernst Haeckel, *The Riddle of the Universe at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1900) 288. In German, the phrase becomes, "Wir gelangen so zu der paradoxen Vorstellung Gottes als eines sogenannten "gasförmigen Wirbelthieres."

⁷ In his *Bloomsday Book* Harry Blamires calls this image of God the nadir of the intellectual chaos that characterises the chapter. I'm not sure that for Joyce blasphemy (even of a Swiftian bent) would necessarily be a negative thing.

⁸ George E. MacDonald, *Fifty Years of Freethought: Being the Story of the Truth Seeker, with the Natural History of its Third* (New York: The Truth Seeker Company, 1929) 458.