



Article Type: Original Research

Page Numbers: 1-16

Article History:

Received: 28 April 2024

Accepted: 03 August 2024

Published: 01 September 2025

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.22034/cls.2025.63759>

Author Details:

1. MA in English Literature,
Shahid Beheshti University,
Tehran, Iran.
shokat.esmaeilzadeh@gmail.com

2. Associate Professor of Modern
Irish and English Literature,
Shahid Beheshti University,
Tehran, Iran. (Corresponding
Author)
s_mansouri@sbu.ac.ir



Radical Ethnic Minorities in *Ulysses*: Leopold Bloom as an Event-Oriented Rebel

Shokat Esmaeilzadeh¹ ; Shahriyar Mansouri^{2*}

Abstract: In James Joyce's *Ulysses*, Leopold Bloom emerges as one of the greatest Irish characters, a temporally indomitable rebel who shatters the regular chronology and enters into the self-created heterogeneous world for the sake of challenging Irish nationalistic sacredness. The multiple characteristics of Leopold's subjective perception of time directs us to Alain Badiou's distinctive ontological reading, in which he proposes the term void as an ignored ontological heterogeneity triggered by the state's monolithic structuration. By localizing the void under the name of the event, the required condition will be prepared for the eligible subject, namely, a rebel to engage idiosyncrasy in hope of changing a future that is still in the formation. By examining *Ulysses*, this article explores the ways in which Leopold's mind embraces a plethora of immediate impressions in the form of failed inconsistencies that can be used as a personal artifact in social context laden with anti-colonial sentiments to first, provide self-created truths, and then reexamine structured situations at the sudden moment of excess, bracing itself for new causal events. Moreover, the article examines miscellaneous, pithy insignificant events as narratorial tropes cast across the spatial-temporal plane of *Ulysses*, diverging the narrative from linear narration, and at the same time distracting the character from approximating their centrality.

Keywords: *Ulysses*; Heterogeneity; James Joyce; Event; Eligible Subject.

Citation: Esmaeilzadeh, S. , and Mansouri, S. . "Radical Ethnic Minorities in *Ulysses*: Leopold Bloom as an Event-Oriented Rebel", *Critical Literary Studies*, 7, 2, 2025, -. doi: 10.22034/cls.2025.63759

1. Introduction

In *Ulysses* James Joyce presents the seemingly quotidian life of marginal characters as the rehash of diverse and often contradictory events, most specifically the clash of the final years of British colonial presence in Ireland and a burgeoning anti-colonial national mentality in the turn of the century Ireland. Leopold Bloom, for instance — a marginal character of Jewish descent — is cast across a chauvinist Irish nationalism that celebrates monolithic identities, to question and counter such structurally politicized socio-cultural events. Where previous scholarship focused on the multilayered narration and characterization, and a unique urbanization of life as a quotidian concern in Joyce's *Ulysses*, this article assays the idiosyncratic and polyvalent structure of Leopold Bloom's event-oriented mind, examining it as an internal heterogeneous momentum that shatters the linearity of time. Leopold's temporally labyrinthine consciousness, this article argues, is sympathetic with the Bergsonian perceptions of time wherein the future is advocated as duration in flux. Undergoing a plethora of immediate impressions, Leopold is introduced to a sudden moment of temporal excess that interrupts his quotidian life, engaging him in an influx of the new events. To address such Joycean polyvalence of presence, we will instrumentalize Alain Badiou's philosophy of ontology laid out in his magnum opus *L'Être et l'Événement* (1988) translated as *Being and Event* published in 2005, in which he examines ontology as a mathematically accurate equation born of various socio-cultural phenomena. Followed by two voluminous sequels, *Logiques des mondes: L'être et l'événement, 2* (2006) translated as *Logic of Worlds: Being and Event II* (2009) and *L'Immanence des vérités* (2018) [*The Immanence of Truths: Being and Event III* (2022)], *Being and Event* (1988/2005) remains a core Badiouian reference, containing his postmodern vision that addresses the rift between ontology and epistemology of presence.

2. Theoretical Framework: Event-Oriented Outer-Directed Qualitative Thoughts

Badiou explicates his new approach to ontology — or the presented world — by underlining its ignored heterogeneity and multiple character since “presentation,” in his view, “is only this multiple” (23). The problem, however, arises when *the structure*, or in Badiou's words, the count-as-one, plays its descriptive role in providing a seemingly homogenized oneness as the situation in that “the multiple is [only] the inertia which the count-as-one must effectively operate in order for there to be Oneness” (25). The ignored ulterior heterogeneity with its forcing condition pushes Badiou to divide the *multiplicity* of any situation into *consistency* and *inconsistency*. “Inconsistency,” according

to Badiou, “is not actually presented as such since all presentation is under the law of the count. Inconsistency as pure multiple is solely the presupposition that prior to the count the one is not” (52). In this respect, in the realm of possible situational presentation, the inconsistent or pure multiples should be passed from the structuration filter lest presentation becomes an impossible impasse for them.

Badiou’s thought-provoking philosophy, however, is structured around its ever-present possibility, occasionally a future-oriented possibility that avoids any fixity. In this case, inconsistent or pure multiple is “inconsistency as what-will-have-been-presented” (Badiou 54). The possible presentation of non-presented multiple of the present moment implies that it is not presented just for now. That is perhaps the reason for Badiou’s conception of the void: “the name of being—of inconsistency—according to a situation” indicating the failure of the count-as-one (56). When *the one* fails to play its descriptive role, the situation will be definitely prepared for the localization of the pure multiplicity, rejecting the absolute abstraction of the void.

In literature, the expansion of certain literary tropes or modes of vocalization can be seen as literary inconsistencies that allow for the multiple to emerge by eliminating other literary stereotypes. For instance, “the development of interior monologue,” according to Declan Kiberd, “was motivated by a need to save literature from the stock characters of Victorian novels, to prevent the complexities of real persons from collapsing into mere types” (*Ulysses and Us* 75). Similarly, Joyce’s works enable the presence of inconsistencies, albeit literary, by taking seemingly idiosyncratic measures to counter typical modes of narration. The disruption of linear narrative also allows the micro narratives to scatter independently and to have a life of their own, without being confirmed by a grand narrative. Such literary independence at the level of narration can be explained in the light of Badiou’s understanding of *presentation* and *representation*. According to Badiou, “Once counted as one in a situation,” such as a fraction of a larger narrative, “a multiple finds itself *presented* therein. If it is also counted as one by the metastructure, or state of the situation, then it is appropriate to say that it is *represented*” (99). Therefore, we deal with presentation in the case of structure, and representation in the case of metastructure. In simple words, although a multiple’s presence in the state’s situation is accepted, its verification or rejection is rooted in representation.

Based on the binary of presentation and representation, Badiou speaks of typology of beings, namely *normal*, *singular*, and *excess*. In *Ulysses*, we deal with Leopold as a singular being who avoids the new fixity. In spite of singular being’s presentation in the

situation, as we shall examine in the coming pages, Leopold's ontological presence is not verified by the state due to its non-representation; therefore, he escapes from the metastructure. The failure of metastructure is regarded as the historical situation in which "a presented multiple is not at the same time a subset of the situation necessarily means that certain multiples from which this multiple is composed do not themselves, belong to the situation" (Badiou 174). Consequently, the situation is ready for the ignored multiplicity to rupture the state's oneness. But how should we recognize an event-oriented multiple separated from the situation among all those multiples the state constantly homogenizes? The subjective action comes to the fore at this level of the evental process.

In his reading of Badiou's philosophy, Quentin Meillassoux plainly elaborates on the importance of the subjective act in the evental scene in a way that "the event required, in order to be effective, what we call a 'co-participation' of the multiple and subject...it required an intervention of the subject capable of recognizing this multiple as an event" (25). In Badiou's definition, a "*subject* [is] any local configuration of a generic procedure from which a truth is supported" (391), which "as local situated configuration, is neither the intervention nor the operator of fidelity, but the advent of their Two, that is, the incorporation of the event into the situation in the mode of a generic procedure" (393).

Firstly, one of the major characteristics of the subject is the local configuration, i.e., the battle of the evental scene starts from the locality to the universality, from the part to the whole. Going back to our discussion considering Badiou's singular multiple, the non-representationality of the singular being provides the required eligibility for the subject to be considered out of the state's universal yardstick. Therefore, it would be regarded as the local configuration which has the eligibility for the interventional act during the evental process. Secondly, the crucial point is the proximate objective characteristic of the subject. The subject's act of incorporation of the event to disrupt the homogeneous scene of situation is out of fanaticism; it does not absolutely intervene in situational issue nor play the big fan of appearing scenario. It just provides its own alternative possibility of given situation through coming chances at a proper time. It should also be highlighted "What makes a Badiouan event rare is the required fidelity to the opening brought about by the event" (Dewsbury 452) since there is no promising result in Badiou's philosophy. The subject should not concern itself with the consequence of the interventional act, and its fidelity. All the subject can do is to take action while maintaining its utopian vision.

3. Analysis

3.1. A Boon or Bane? Irish Nationalistic State and Its Normative Structuration

By the rise of strong cultural nationalist movement, in D. George Boyce's view, "Ireland ... broke away from the United Kingdom and evolved a completely independent sovereign" nation (375). Nationalism, in this regard, has historically been leveraged by nations including Ireland to create their own distinctive 'self.' William J. Swart considers nationalism as a reaction used by the Irish State in response to the suppressing political situation to reach its autonomous development (140). It works as a sudden eventual cosmetic device serving the state's politics of normalcy. According to Boyce, nationalism "is the assertion by members of a group of autonomy and self-government for the group (often, but not invariably, in a sovereign state), of its solidarity and fraternity in the homeland, and of its distinctive history and culture" (19). Ireland finally succeeded to form its own free ontological existence in 1922, which sympathizes with what Badiou sees as deploying "the ruled order—the consistency—of what is nothing other than the suture-to-being of any situation" (56). Irish situation constantly declares its existence through celebrating its nationalism and creating normative structures to have the homogeneous society. Yet as Amartya Sen investigates, should one consider "nationalism a boon or bane?" (39).

Sen starts his article examining both positive and negative side effects of nationalism, tracing how nationalism can result in hierarchal relation among nations. Considering the negative aspects, Sen emphasizes "the lines of national divisions" i.e. the very boundaries that nationalists create by themselves to celebrate their distinctive national features (39). Although he agrees with the profitable feature of nationalism resulting in the creation of "identities, such as religion, community or ethnicity," its boundary-making causes sudden political bifurcations and socio-cultural polarizations (Sen 39). When the anti-colonial Free State superimposes its pervasive structuration on the Irish, any "Inconsistency is not actually presented as such since all presentation is under the law of the count" (Badiou 52). In "Nestor," the second Episode of *Ulysses*, Joyce beautifully creates a conversation between Stephen and the school principal, Mr. Deasy, to highlight the Irish excessive nationalism, and anti-Semitism as a result. When Mr. Deasy asked Stephen "Ireland, they say, has the honour of being the only country which never persecuted the jews. Do you know that? No. And do you know why?" (36), the principle responds himself "Because she [Ireland] never let them in" (36). While the Irish State represents the structured nationhood, it injects the ubiquitous identity among its people

who would share similar features together. As a result, as Boyce considers, “the individual’s essence is no longer simply his social position, he must carry his identity with him: his ‘culture’ becomes his identity; and classification of men by culture is the classification of nationality” (376). Any opposing or non-opposing figures must accept Irish normative structure if they seek acceptance. Such nation-wide universalism, however, clashes with individual’s independence, and hence should be addressed.

In the context of Badiou’s philosophy, ubiquitous identity should be regarded as “[only] the operational result”, rather than the very basis of the real anti-colonial Irish situation (24). To challenge the supposed structurally consistent state through universal yardstick, we need to reverse the trajectory and embrace reductionism: to move away from structural wholeness towards minor foundational parts. However, to fully appreciate change we should ascend from the part to challenge the universal wholeness. Beneath any seemingly structured situation, there would be some neglected inconsistencies that are not allowed to be in society due to their illegitimate condition.

Even though the Irish State did its best to honor its structurally homogenized nationality to conquer Britain as the suppressing state, it contains instances of Badiouian inconsistency within itself. That is why “in recent years,” as L. Perry Curtis Jr. suggests, “Irish historians have begun to look more closely into the strategies and tactics of nineteenth-century nationalism, exposing some of the disunities and inconsistencies in a movement long considered monolithic by generations of patriots and ideologues” (150). All we have concerning any nationalistic movement including the Irish one is the seemingly homogenized and monolithic movement as merely “the inertia which the count-as-one must effectively operate in order for there to be Oneness”, independent nation state in this case (Badiou 25). Nevertheless, the inconsistency can come from within the structuration itself, and hence the self-destructive nature of presentation. This is an observable truth in the context of anti-colonial Ireland, where a revolution as an inconsistency with promises of multiplicity and change ends in imposing further limitations on the nation. As Boyce claims, “The Irish revolution was fast assuming the character of the most unstable of all revolutions: it was incomplete. It was incomplete in that Ireland was not wholly ‘free’, it was not united” (341).

The mentioned incomplete unity is the very inconsistency we should understand to find a place to exist out of the given ontological condition. On what condition, however, does inconsistency emerge within any national structuration including that of Ireland? There is always the possibility for the appearance of such heterogeneity through the

localization of Badiou's void which "indicates the failure of the one", namely, the situation with positive promises in near prospect (56), or the mentioned homogenized scene. Considering *Ulysses* as Joyce's symbolic depiction of a burgeoning anti-colonial spirit imbued with nationalism in early twentieth century Ireland, Molly Bloom's affair can be considered as an internalized embodiment of Badiou's void: in addition to the interruption it creates in their quotidian marital life, it interrupts Leopold's mind with heterogamous ideas which mostly stand in contrast to the Irish accepted conventions.

3.2. Inconceivable Encounter: Leopold's Self-Induced Wandering

We have so far considered Molly's affair as void, bifurcating our view of the narrative: Leopold's cuckoldry from one side, and Molly's adultery from the other. Leopold is mostly denounced by other characters in *Ulysses*, as the one "of no fixed abode", or "a well-known dynamitard, forger, bigamist, bawd and cuckold and a public nuisance to the citizens of Dublin" (Joyce 470). When Leopold tries to accommodate and digest Molly's affair, he replaces the given ideas with a self-given form of new immediate impressions that welcomes disintegration resulting in an inner subjective experience of time. Such wanderings can be appreciated as partly self-induced, event-oriented locomotive outbursts, and partly as a fruit of being a socio-ideologically denounced figure in Dublin. Leopold, nevertheless, idles the city during which his mind is cropped up by many disintegrated new ideas in a form of interior monologue. In Episode 4 also known as "Calypso," for instance, when Leopold goes to the butcher Dlugacz's and folds the sausages, he "took up a page from the pile of cut sheets. The model of farm at Kinnereth on the lakeshore of Tiberias. Can become an ideal winter sanatorium. Moses Montefiore" (Joyce 59). The way that a single page from the pile of cut sheets spontaneously diverts Leopold's mind to Moses Montefiore, the one who stood for Jewish rights connects with Bergson's pure duration in which "the succession of our conscious states assumes when our ego lets itself live," without any intervention (100). In this way, Leopold loses track of chronological perception of time and undergoes the continuous and unmeasurable flow of thought.

When Patrick Parrinder identifies Leopold as "a meticulous observer of life, so that we are aware ... of the *quality* of his mind" (Joyce 143), he highlights the qualitative value of Bergsonian perception of time. In Bergson's philosophy, pure duration is defined as "a succession of qualitative changes, which melt into and permeate one another, without precise outlines, without any tendency to externalize themselves in relation to one another, without any affiliation with number: it would be pure heterogeneity" (104).

We experience the very qualitative thought of Leopold since we have direct access to his pure experience in the form of interior monologue; moreover, the reason his experiences are non-mediated is threefold: they appear spontaneously as “immediate impressions” (Bergson 54), withstanding the given mediated experiences by conventions; they are not externalized yet; and finally, these immediate impressions as a pure duration are absolutely heterogeneous. However, why are these immediate impressions considered heterogeneous? According to Kiberd, “The interior monologues of *Ulysses* permitted Joyce to contrast the richness of a man’s imaginative life with the poverty of his social intercourse,” creating a heterogeneous contrast (“Introduction” xxxviii). The contrast comes from the fact that “A person’s inner life may become so splendid and challenging as to disable him or her for all contacts with the world” (Kiberd, *The Irish Writer* 239-240). Consequently, we are still stuck with Leopold’s heterogeneous thoughts that lack any external values. Undoubtedly, the homogenized Irish nationalistic state withstands any challenging subjective experience of time as singular heterogeneity threatens its unified wholeness.

3.3. Catholic Irish State and Jewish Eligible Subject: Leopold's Entrance to the Evental Scene

Following Molly’s affair as a Badiouian void, we should know what makes Leopold eligible to challenge the homogenized nationalistic Irish state through his heterogeneous inner experience of time. Leopold’s Jewishness fits Badiou’s conception of singular being: the one who is presented and lives in the Irish state; yet, he is neither represented nor verified by the Catholic nation. Oscillation between being accepted and non-accepted in the mostly Catholic society as a singular being creates special condition for Leopold in which he appears to be entangled within a historical situation, the sort wherein he is on the threshold of evental site through which he encounters what Badiou calls “the minimal effect of structure” (175). Subsequent to such minimal effect of structure, the situation, therefore, is prepared for Leopold to challenge the normative structuration. By losing the given facts and instead replacing them with the heterogeneous immediate impressions, Leopold comes closer to Badiou’s remarks on the subject: “a subject is not a result anymore than it is an origin” (392). Leopold is not the result of nationalistic ubiquity like other subjects. Rather, his different and disintegrated views can be considered as his self-given original status. However, we should never forget the following consequences happen to Leopold due to his distinctive status in the seemingly homogenous scene of Irish state.

Leopold's Jewishness, nevertheless, contradicts the unique consistent order of the mostly Catholic Irish society, and exclusion ensues. As a result, Leopold's perspective cannot be wholly presented and more importantly, easily accepted in current socio-political situation. His perspectives stand merely as a personal evaluation, being generated by the singular subject in a seemingly stage fashion. In this respect, in Episode twelve or "Cyclops," for instance, there is a dialogue between Leopold and other characters about the Jews and the definition of nation in which we have Leopold's famous statement: "A nation is the same people living in the same place" (Joyce 331). The crucial point is that how the narrator as a hailed Irish subject of the dominant ideology intervenes Leopold's participation in a dialogue and stands as the epitome of excessively nationalist people; as the narrator says, "Didn't I tell you? As true as I'm drinking this porter if he [Leopold] was at his last grasp he'd try to downface you that dying was living" (Joyce 329). Such excessive rootedness and failed inconsistency manifested as nationalistic pride, as Brenda Maddox examines, prompts Joyce to portray his people as "failures [...], people who cannot take the chances life offers them", perhaps to appreciate collectivity and multiculturalism (ix). Leopold's Jewishness, therefore, causes his ideas not to be in line with the imposed socio-political circumstances or the count-as-one and they seem nonsense to the ideologically interpolated beings of the state. Additionally, the narrator even claims that killing Leopold would be a "justifiable homicide" (Joyce 338).

Nevertheless, Leopold attempts to lose any given identity for the sake of creating its own original one since he "is valued to precisely the extent that he can recognise the stranger in himself" (Kiberd, *The Irish Writer* 303). In other words, he would never lose the created chance, albeit considered as an outsider. He even dares enough to revisit history and intervene the linear movement of time by starting from the very beginning of history that Jesus is a Jew; as he claims "Mendelsshon was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza. And the Saviour was a jew and his father was a jew. Your God" (Joyce 342). In search of self-given identity, when the special condition is prepared for the event, Leopold as the faithful subject follows the new happenings. Through his perseverance to rethink the given pasts, he proves his eligibility. Kiberd identifies Leopold as "A committed wanderer," since "he knows that movement is better than stasis" (*Ulysses and Us* 82). It was Leopold's perseverance and commitment that took him from the simple paper to the political figure like Moses Montefiore.

In "Calypso," the folding scene directs Leopold's mind to Moses Montefiore, whose significance, as Don Gifford and Robert J. Seidman consider, lies in his intentions,

namely, to “use his influence and wealth to secure political emancipation of Jews in England, to alleviate Jewish suffering elsewhere in Europe, and to encourage the colonization of Palestine” (73). The very essential point concerning Montefiore’s political act is that he used his influence for the emancipation of Jews not only in England but also elsewhere in Europe. Why our excluded character, the one as the Jew who lives in the mostly Catholic Ireland, develops doubt concerning the person who stood for the marginalized group in multiple places in the world?

In order to answer the mentioned question, it is necessary to clarify how any challenging procedure depends upon Leopold’s own interventional act of subjectivization. Leopold’s subjectivization here refers to one of the most important features of a faithful subject. In Badiou’s terms, “Subjectivization takes place in the form of a Two. It is directed towards the intervention on the borders of the evental site. But it is also directed towards the situation through its coincidence with the rule of evaluation and proximity which founds the generic procedure” (Badiou 392). The mentioned proximity refers to the objectivity of the subject in a way that it acts out of fanaticism; it does not absolutely intervene in the situational issue such as the condition of Jews; nor does it play a significant role in defending Jews’ specific rights in Ireland. If Leopold wants to defend Jews’ specific condition in Ireland, we could see a new hierarchy such as the priority of Jews living in Ireland to other Jews living in different parts of the world. It is not Jews’ specific exclusion in Ireland that concerns Leopold; rather, it is the matter of any excluded minorities in any different part of the world.

Joyce’s sympathy with Jews embodied by Leopold’s special state in the mostly Irish Catholic society has been already examined by many scholars. Andrew Gibson, for instance, reads *Ulysses* closely in a complex Irish historical context and considers Leopold’s religiosity as a double identity, i.e. being “both Jew and Irishman at once” (43). Accordingly, the term like “Irish Jew” applied to Leopold’s condition to consider two opposing religions at the same time. Similarly, when Ira Bruce Nadel talks about “the predicament of Bloom, of seeking to be Irish but unable to renounce his Jewishness,” he states Leopold’s desire to keep a specific religion, whether the Irish Catholicism, or his own Jewishness (304). Yet, limiting Leopold’s odd condition to any defined and specific religion appears as a tautological error in light of Badiou’s conception of the singular being.

“The chief characteristics of nationalism in Ireland,” in Boyce’s words, “have been race, religion, and a strong sense of territorial unity and integrity” (19). As such, religion

can be seen as one of the salient features through which nationalistic states including Ireland celebrate their uniqueness. As a Badiouian subject which “is not a result anymore than it is an origin” (392), Leopold replaces such a given ideological identity with an original self-given identity, the sort that is devoid of ideological discrimination. In simple words, being both a Jew and an Irish or Irish Jew would never provide any better situation for Leopold. The alternative way is to consider Leopold’s religiosity as non-identarian identity, i.e. being neither Jew nor Irish, or as we call it being a non-Irish-non-Jew. Returning to episode four, “Calypso,” as the very first chapter in which we are introduced to Leopold, we see he goes shopping “Better a pork kidney at Dlugacz’s” (Joyce 56). In Gifford’s and Seidman’s annotation, it has been brought Dlugacz’s as “The only pork butcher in Dorset Street Upper” and “Jewish dietary laws forbid the eating of pork” (70). This chiefly argued irony brings the most important issues of Joyce’s masterpiece, in Ching-ying Hsu’s words, “‘non-Jewish Jewishness,’ sharing the border-crossing quality of being simultaneously Jew and non-Jew” (238). Moreover, Leopold suffers from another identarian issue, namely, being a Catholic convert, which according to G. F. Rutan, “has been synonymous with *Irish*” (740). In “Hades” or Episode 6, for going to the Dignam’s funeral, we have Leopold in company with Martin Cunningham, Mr. Powers, and Simon Dedalus who sit together in the carriage, as they see a Jew “stumping round the corner of Elvery’s elephant” (Joyce 94). Here is when we are introduced to the anti-Semite attitude of Cunningham, when “His eyes met Mr Bloom’s eyes. He caressed his beard, adding: We have all been there” (Joyce 94), emphasizing the fictionality of encountering “the animosity of ‘Jewish’ moneylenders” (Gifford and Seidman 110). Cunningham, in other words, generalizes anti-Semitism after seeing Leopold specifically, subjectively expanding a nationally normalized Catholic exclusivity as identity: “Religion [Catholicism] in Ireland was ... much more than theology and liturgy. It became sheer identity, distilled and purified. That identity became the single great basis for Irish nationalism” (Rutan 741). More importantly, it is not just the matter of being a Jew. As Rutan mentions, “Protestantism was an alien force,” too it seems, being “part of the process of conquest and garrison imperialism” (741). In this respect, Leopold’s religious inconsistency lends itself to non-defined-identity, i.e., being neither Irish nor Jew, hence non-Irish-non-Jew.

3.4. The Utopian Bloomusalem: Leopold Self-Created Blooming Future

Leopold’s non-identarianism defies not only his Jewishness but whatever the state imposes. Being a lost wanderer, Leopold subjectively experienced the chain of new heterogeneous inner ideas which stood in a stark contrast to the nationalistic Ireland

celebrating its unique ontological existence. His condition as an ostracized persona provides Leopold with the required eligibility to enter the evental scene through a subjective interventional act. In order to liberate himself, he recasts the given ontology in a new light through its faithful persistence. In Episode 15 also known as “Circe,” as Leopold’s dreamscape, we observe Leopold reflecting on the coming golden age, i.e., Bloomusalem: “My beloved subjects, a new era is about to dawn. I, Bloom, tell you verily it is even now at hand. Yea, on the word of a Bloom, ye shall ere long enter into the golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future” (Joyce 484). Considering the specific use of first person pronouns, the most emphasized notion in this self-reflective scene is the subjectivity that Leopold uses to underline a mental momentum set in a hypothetical future.

Leopold’s religiosity appears as a non-defined identity: it is neither Jewishness nor Irishness, which will bring anything for anyone. In this respect, Leopold, the one labelled as Jew, instead of talking about Jerusalem, announces the start of golden city called ‘the new Bloomusalem.’ Leopold puts emphasis on his own being rather than on religions. By giving priority to existence, gradually we move to the central role one subject can have in the supposedly static situation. Being very personalized and dreamy, the subjective nomination does not make sense in the current situation; it should not since it “‘will have been’ presented in a *new* situation” (Badiou 398). It is the very essential characteristic of nomination to be non-existed in the present situation. One of the most important issues is that whether all those new seemingly impossible possibilities popped up in Leopold’s mentally temporal artifact creates any practical change or not. In Badiou’s words, it should be surveyed whether all those mentally minimal existences of the events will result in the maximal existence of the given situation at the end. All in all, it seems there may be no worthwhile result out of Leopold’s temporality in the exclusive ontological existence of Ireland. The very positive outlook is to look forward to the possible promising future that subjects like Bloom can have during its subjective process, i.e. “the post-evental truth of a situation” (Badiou 391-392).

Apart from the future-oriented words like ‘new era’ in the mentioned quote and more importantly, Leopold’s name itself which “Means ‘the people prince’ ... [and] the sing of ... good future” (Gifford and Seidman 70), the utopian aspect of Leopold’s self-created state can be studied mostly from the very last word Bloom emphasized in his speech, i.e., Nova Hibernia which in Latin means “New Ireland” (Gifford and Seidman 475). The crucial point of subjectivization process for Badiou is “interventional nomination *from the standpoint of the situation*, that is, the rule of the intra-situational effects of the

supernumerary name's entrance into circulation" (393). Leopold's future state, consequently, does not eradicate the current situation or Ireland as a whole; Irish state will be there since it is the inevitable part of ontology. Leopold's coming state, therefore, comes from within the situation not from without it or out of nowhere. The sole problem is the existing bridge between the old situation and the new. All we need is the possibility of the inclusion of exclusions, i.e., the self-created state coming from the 'intra'-situational effects after the current situation is demolished, and the new one is created. That is why there is "an essential link between destruction and novelty", according to Badiou (407), indicating the supplementary feature of the coming truth.

In the context of the significance of nomination, one question, however, may arise: what is the difference between named state like Ireland and Nova Hibernia? Is not naming or labeling any situation considered as boundary marking contradicting the eventual aim? The central point of Badiou's event is the concept of inexistency. Similar to our discussion concerning nomination, the resulted truth out of the appearing event is "an indiscernible part of the situation" (Badiou 406), which should be engaged by any specific faithful subject like Leopold. More importantly, the indiscernible part indicates that, the eligible Leopold is going to faithfully take act in the eventual scene, and persistently discern the temporary 'inexistence' parts which can be existed in blooming future.

4. Conclusion

Modernist writers create separate path for their writings by using one of the most famous and salient devices, namely, interior monologue, which provides a thorough showcase of the mind of the characters, creating worlds within worlds. When the reader engages in reading such literary works, they touch the very direct experience of characters without any extra interferences in the narrative. In *Ulysses*, however, Joyce represents the outer-directed value of interior monologue in social context through his sympathy with Jewish ostracism in the mostly Irish Catholic society. As such, shattering the chronological order of the narrative enables the micro narratives or uncanny ostracized characters like Leopold Bloom to have a life of their own, without entertaining the idea of forming a grand narrative, or being confirmed by it.

Meanwhile, the inconceivable encounter with immediate impressions characterized by the heterogeneity and qualitative differences grants our non-Irish-non-Jewish odd man an eligible distinctive vision to challenge the assimilating Irish nationalistic ontological wholeness. Unequivocally demanding the heroic act, the procedure requires

the outcast's voluntarily constant persistence and fidelity to recast the given ontology. By keeping his utopian vision, Leopold Bloom, the eligible subject, faithfully provides his self-created truth and self-given identity, without worrying himself about consequences set by the state.

Funding:

There is no funding support.

Authors' Contribution:

The authors have written the article in a complete collaboration.

Conflict of Interests:

This research does not conflict with personal and/or organizational interests.

References

- Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*. Translated by Oliver Feltham. London: Continuum, 2005.
- Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Translated by F. L. Pogson. New York: Dover Publication Inc, 2001.
- Boyce, D. George. *Nationalism in Ireland*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Curtis Jr., L. Perry. "Moral and Physical Force: The Language of Violence in Irish Nationalism." *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1998, pp. 150-189.
- Dewsbury, J. D. "Unthinking Subjects: Alain Badiou and the Event of Thought in Thinking Politics." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 2007, pp. 443-459.
- Gibson, Andrew. *Joyce's Revenge: History, Politics, and Aesthetics in Ulysses*. Oxford: Oxford, 2002.
- Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Hsu, Ching-ying. *Love and the Ethics of Subaltern Subjectivity in James Joyce's Ulysses*. Durham University, PhD dissertation, 2014.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. New York: Vintage International, 1990.
- Kiberd, Declan. Introduction. *Ulysses*, by James Joyce. London: Penguin, 1992, pp. ix-lxxx.
- . *The Irish Writer and the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge, 2005.
- . *Ulysses and Us: The Art of Everyday Living*. London: Faber and Faber, 2009.
- Maddox, Brenda. Introduction. *Dubliners*, by James Joyce. New York: Bantam Classic, 1990, pp. vii-xxiii.
- Meillassoux, Quentin. "Decision and Undecidability of the Event in Being and Event I and II." Translated by Alyosha Edlebi, *Parrhesia*, No. 19, 2014, pp. 22-35.
- Nadel, Ira Bruce. "Joyce and the Jews." *Modern Judaism*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1976, pp. 301-310.
- Parrinder, Patrick. *James Joyce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Rutan, G. F. "The Parting of the Way: The Changing Relationship Between Religion and Nationalism in Contemporary Ireland." *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1996, pp. 740-755.

Sen, Amartya. "Is Nationalism a Boon or a Curse?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 43, No. 7, 2008, pp. 39-44.

Swart, William J. "Constructing the 'Self' of Self-Determination: Liberal and Anti-Liberal Tensions in Modern Irish Nationalism." *Social Thought and Research*, Vol. 22, No. 1/2, 1999, pp. 139-136.