INTRODUCTION

Ulysses advertises itself as a novel that includes and says it all, yet the experience of annotating the novel and teaching it with the aid of the annotations suggests that often what is not said is central to our experience of the novel. For example, *Ulysses* seems to time itself meticulously by the clock, when in fact it stretches the clock in many ways to place its characters' actions at the intersection of two contrasting orders of literary time.

Likewise, the novel is suffused with Irish political, religious, and social preoccupations and prejudices, but these are nowhere fully stated or deployed. Leopold Bloom, the novel's central character, is Jewish by heritage though not by practice, and he is the outsider, the obvious focus of a constant, for the most part muted, drumfire of anti-Semitism in the course of the day. Not so obvious is that Dublin's anti-Semitism is played against the larger backdrop of the anti-Semitism that was sweeping Europe in the opening decades of this century. A similar observation can be made about the role of women in the novel. Individual women as characters are set against and confined by the position of women in Dublin, that city, as Joyce was fond of saying, on the benighted fringe of Europe. The terms of that confinement are everywhere in the novel by implication but are nowhere explicit.

Money and monetary values are also central to the middle-class world on which Joyce focuses, but the novel's method precludes any direct consideration of the values of money or of the relation of money to individual middle-class lives in that city and at that time.

The intention of the following brief discussions of these matters is therefore pedagogical, as is the intention of the annotations themselves—to help the reader grasp some general issues understated in the novel and therefore treated in a fragmentary way in the specific annotations.

Time in *Ulysses*

The action of Ulysses takes place at the confluence of two orders of literary time: dramatic time and epic time as Aristotle defines them in the *Poetics:* "Tragedy [drama] endeavors, as far

as possible, to confine itself to a single revolution of the sun; . . . whereas the Epic action has no limits of time."[1] A modern translator might be inclined to render this passage as applying not to the action imitated but to the time of performance: a drama to be performed in a single day, an epic to be performed over a period of several days.[2] But earlier translators, such as Butcher (a copy of whose translation was in Joyce's Trieste library),[3] assumed Aristotle to mean that drama was to *imitate* the events of a single day, as *Ulysses* does: from 8:00 A.M., 16 June 1904, until sometime during the long summer dawn of 17 June 1904 (sunrise was at 3:33 A.M.). And *Ulysses* enjoys the other unities Aristotle recommended for drama: it has unity of place (Dublin and environs); unity of action (all the action takes place in a single day); and, as good Sophoclean drama, Ulysses has three central characters (Stephen Dedalus, Molly Bloom, and Leopold Bloom) as well as a chorus (of Dubliners) that, as Aristotle said it should, functions collectively as a fourth character.

But the novel's title announces an epic, and Aristotle defines an epic action not as the whole course of a hero's life, because that would lack unity of action, but as the whole course of a major phase in the life. Thus *The Odyssey* traces Odysseus's homecoming from Troy, together with Penelope's faithful waiting and Telemachus's coming of age; in *Ulysses* it is Stephen's coming of age, Bloom's homecoming, Molly's affirmation of her husband, and Dublin (as Ithaca) once more (or for once) properly governed. There is no assurance in *Ulysses* that any of these epic actions are being or will be lived through to completion, but by novel's end we as readers should know what conditions the central characters and the chorus will have to meet if the epic destiny that is "possible" on 16–17 June 1904 is to become "actuality" (*Ulysses* 2.67 [25:35–36]).

In dramatic time, in contrast to the epic's slow development of a phase-in-the-life, the action we anticipate is *peripeteia*, an abrupt or unexpected change that is both revelatory and conclusive. Thus, the action in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* is the discovery in the course of one day that Oedipus is the contaminator of Thebes, the man destined by the gods to kill his own father and to marry and have children by his mother. In the *peripeteia* of drama the entire course of Oedipus's life is abruptly reviewed and changed in a single day, in contrast to the gradual narrative process of *The Odyssey*.

As in a good epic, *Ulysses* begins *in medias res* and fills us in on Stephen's life since the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* by flashback; and by the flashback of memory we are given the story of Molly's and Bloom's lives.[4] *The Odyssey* similarly begins less than three weeks before Odysseus lands on Ithaca, and coils back to tell the story of the years since the departure from Troy before moving forward into the events that take place after Odysseus's arrival on Ithaca. But, as in drama, the action of *Ulysses* stays *in medias res*, in the present tense of one day rather than in a succession of days: to the characters, this is only a day-in-the-life, exceptional in more or less trivial ways as all days are, but not all that different from yesterday and tomorrow. Only we as readers know that the characters are both acting in the dramatic time of a play, complete with *peripeteia*, and, by implication rather than by action, completing a major phase of their lives in the narrative medium of epic time. So while we judge significance in relation to our expectations of dramatic and epic time, the characters move in what might be called mimetic time: various imitations of time, a rich mix of clock time, psychological time, and mnemonic time.

As for clock time, *Ulysses* implies throughout that we ought to be able to clock this day with some precision; but that turns out not to be consistently the case. Nor did Joyce help matters when he suggested differing timetables in the two extant schemas, the one he sent to Carlo Linati in 1920[5] and the one he provided Jacques Benoîst-Méchin in 1921 (published by Stuart Gilbert in 1931).[6] For example, Joyce told Linati that the Lotus-Eaters episode begins at 9:00 A.M.; the other schema gives the time as 10:00 A.M. In either case all of Bloom's activities from the beginning of the hour on Sir John Rogerson's Quay until he exits from the church (5.1–461 [pp. 71–84]) take place in fifteen minutes; Bloom reflects that it's "Quarter past" (5.462 [84:2]) and that he still has time for a

1 S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art with a Critical Text and Translation of the Poetics* (London, 1907), p. 23.

2 Gerald F. Else, *Aristotle, "Poetics"* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1967), pp. 24–25.

3 Richard Ellmann, *The Consciousness of Joyce* (New York, 1977), p. 99; Joyce used the edition cited in n. 2 above.

4 John Henry Raleigh, *The Chronicle of Leopold and Molly Bloom: "Ulysses" as Narrative* (Berkeley, Calif., 1977).

5 Richard Ellmann, *Ulysses on the Liffey* (New York, 1972), Appendix pp. 186ff.

6 Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's "Ulysses,"* rev. ed. (New York, 1952).

bath before the funeral at 11:00 A.M. Bloom's circuitous route from the quayside to the chemist's shop would have taken at least fifteen minutes and would have left no time at all for his pause in church. And after midnight 16–17 June 1904, clock time becomes less and less certain. Midnight strikes just after Bloom arrives at Bella Cohen's brothel (15.1362 [478:16]), and by 16.1603–4 (657:20–21) it's "getting on for one," after an extraordinarily active two hundred pages, or 5,208 lines of text in the Critical Edition.

If the Ithaca episode begins at 2:00 A.M., as the Gilbert schema says, then Stephen and Bloom must part at 2:30-plus. Bloom, left alone, is aware of "the incipient intimations of proximate dawn" (17.1247–48 [704:30]). Sunrise in Dublin on 17 June 1904 was at 3:33 A.M., so, depending on the cloud cover, daylight would have begun to gray things as early as 2:00 A.M. Would it help to move Circe, Eumaeus, and Ithaca back an hour, as the Linati schema does, relocating Ithaca at 1:00 A.M.? That would ease the timetable from the beginning of Ithaca to firstlight to sunrise and almost make it believable that Molly hears the chimes of "George's church" ring "2 oclock" (18.1231–32 [772:27–28]), but it would incredibly clog the hours from 11:00 P.M. to 1:00 A.M.

If elaborate efforts to establish accurate timetables tend to falter, they also tend to mislead our attention as readers and distract us from the variety of ways Joyce imitates time. We are all aware, for example, that we can think and perceive far more in the course of a few minutes of multi-leveled consciousness than we could spell out in words in as many hours. Joyce variously explores that disparity. At 8.481 (164:23) Bloom reflects that it is "five minutes" since he fed the birds from O'Connell Bridge, and it *is* a five-minute stroll from the bridge to the front of Trinity College where Bloom is, but he feeds the birds at 8.75–76 (153:7–8), a good twenty-minute read away. Twenty minutes of prose time is being manipulated to imitate five minutes of half-formed thought-perception time, thought-perception that could be verbalized but usually is not.

There are even more radical experiments with the disparities between clock time, psychological time, and the imitation of time in the Circe and Penelope episodes. Because the Circe episode is cast in the form of a play with speeches and stage directions, we assume that reading time is approximately equal to playing time. But the reverse is the case: there is a radical disparity between reading time and playing time. For example, the hallucination at 15.1354–1956 (pp. 478–99), which we associate with Bloom, actually takes place between the two halves of Zoe's speech: "Go on. Make a stump speech out of it. . . . Talk away till you're black in the face." And again at 15.2750 (527:10), Bella Cohen, the whoremistress, enters with the line, "My word! I'm all of a muck-sweat," and continues at 15.3500 (555:2–3), "Which of you was playing the dead march from *Saul*?" The implication is that the hallucinations we associate with Bloom are acted out not for his witness but for ours; what are mere blips on the screen of his consciousness are dramatized and spelled out for us. Psychoanalysts I have consulted about Bloom's hallucinations say that the ones we associate with him would unfold not in the course of one night's dreams, but over a period of about two years for the average patient undergoing analysis. In other words, the hallucinations last only a moment in dramatic time but are spelled out in a dramatic imitation of epic time, the two years or so of this phase-in-the-life.

In the Penelope episode the prose seems to imitate the way Molly might mutter to herself. Read aloud, the duration of the episode is three hours. Is that the order of time Joyce is imitating? Or is the muttering voice of the prose in turn imitating the foreshortened time and kaleidoscopic scatter of image we experience in brief spells of insomnia, an hour or less by the clock? I suspect that the Penelope episode's time is more like the time of hallucination and drama in Circe than it is like the time of a voice overheard and, therefore, that Molly's soliloquy belongs at once in the dramatic and the epic dimensions of time.

Ulysses and Its Times

The outstanding political issues of the time for Dublin and Ireland were land reform and Home Rule. In 1904 land reform was still being resisted by landlords with big holdings, and the peasant-tenants on many estates were still living and laboring in grinding poverty; but in terms of legislation and practice, land reform was at least getting under way. From Joyce's urban point of view the real issue was Home Rule. In 1800 a quasi-independent Irish Parliament had been pressured and bribed by the English into passing the Act of Union and in so doing had dissolved itself and been absorbed into the English Parliament at Westminster. The results were an Ireland ruled politically all-but-directly

from London; an Irish economy dominated by absentee landlords who had followed the center of power from Dublin to London; and a century of constitutional agitation and sporadic violence in Ireland for repeal of the Act of Union and for the establishment of an independent Irish parliamentary government.

In the 1880s, under the forceful leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell (1846–91), a nationalist majority of the Irish members of Parliament achieved a well-coordinated coalition that held the balance of power between the Liberal and Conservative (Tory) parties at Westminster. In 1886 Parnell exploited this position to the verge of passage of a Home Rule Bill, a near-miss that, for most Irish, seemed to promise eventual success for constitutional achievement of Home Rule. But Parnell's extraordinary power to unify dissolved in controversy in December 1890, when his ten-year liaison with Katherine O'Shea was revealed in the divorce action brought by her husband, Capt. William Henry O'Shea. Parnell's career was abruptly ruined, and his increasingly strident efforts to recoup ruined his already precarious health. With Parnell's collapse came the Great Split among Irish nationalists and the end of anything resembling unity and accord in Irish politics. John Redmond (1856–1918) emerged from the wreckage as titular leader of the nationalists, but by 1904 he had achieved little more than a semblance of unity in his party, and what many, including Joyce, called the "betrayal" of Parnell continued to haunt that age of splinter-group politics in Ireland.

One of the most important factors in the collapse of Parnell's career (and in the social and political scene of all Ireland) was the Irish Roman Catholic church. Church leaders remained quiet during the divorce trial so as not to appear to be interfering in politics, but once the trial was over and the Great Split had taken place, they were unrelenting in their denunciation of Parnell. The result was a bitter divisiveness in the Catholic community (90 percent of the Irish) that compounded the political dissension. (See *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,* chapter 1:C [the Christmas dinner], for a capsule dramatization of that bitterness and its potential for violence.)

In 1904 the Protestant Anglo-Irish minority (10 percent) was economically and politically dominant and profoundly conservative and defensive. The Catholic majority was in its contrasting way equally conservative—puritanical and censorious—and defensive in ways one does not expect of a 90 percent majority. The result was a bewildering maze of prejudice and intolerance, which was intensified by the infiltration into Dublin of growing continental prejudice against the Jews. That prejudice, although far less virulent in 1904 Ireland than in Germany, France, and Russia, emerges as a major theme in *Ulysses*.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary,* the terms *anti-Semitic* and *anti-Semite* first appeared in English in a note entitled "Our Library Table" in *The Athenaeum* (London, 3 September 1881):

> Anti-Semitic literature is very prosperous in Germany; there scarcely passes a week without another production on the matter, *pro* or *contra,* without, however, new results for history. But we are glad to mention that at last a serious book has appeared on the present condition of the Jews and their statistics by Herr Richard Andree. . . . The author, apparently an anti-Semite, has honestly collected second-hand information concerning Jews in all countries, which may be usefully consulted since the sources are indicated in the footnotes.

The terms were first coined in German in 1879–80 by the pamphleteer Wilhelm Marr, whose pamphlet *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum* (The Victory of Judaism over Germanism) (Bern, February 1879) was the "first anti-Semitic best-seller."[7] Marr argued that Jews in Germany had already taken over the press, they had become "dictators of the financial system," and they were on the verge of taking over the legislature and the judiciary. These accusations were not original with Marr, nor was his pamphlet a cause so much as a symptom of the stridency and cruelty of anti-Jewish hysteria in late-nineteenth-century Germany and Europe.

In Russia, in the aftermath of the Russo-Turkish War (1877–79), several reactionary newspapers waged a virulent anti-Jewish campaign, and anti-Jewish rioting broke out in the south in 1879–80. The Procurator of the Holy Synod joined the campaign in 1880, and the blood libel (that Jews used the sacrificial blood of a Christian—preferably a child—in the celebration of Passover) was revived (see 6.771–72n). When the relatively liberal Czar Alexander II (1818–81; czar 1855–81) was assassinated in 1881, cruel oppression of the Jews and widespread pogroms became government policy. What Harold Frederic (1856–98) called the

7 Jacob Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933* (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), p. 260.

"New Exodus" began:[8] within a single generation some 2.5 million eastern European Jews were forced to seek new homes overseas.

German propaganda and Russian cruelty soon infected the Austro-Hungarian Empire and, with the violent public controversy over the Dreyfus case (1894–1906),[9] France. Even England, although it carried on its tradition of tolerance and offered sanctuary to many of those displaced in the New Exodus, was infected—witness Haines's remark in the first episode of *Ulysses:* "I don't want to see my country fall into the hands of German jews either" (1.666–67 [21:20–21]).

In the irony of retrospect, this new wave of persecution began only a few decades after the Jews had achieved considerable legal, political, and economic emancipation in western Europe and, to a surprising extent, even in Russia. And it differed from past waves in that it involved not only a reinvigoration of the old Christian prejudice against the Jews[10] but also the new "patriotic" prejudice of the modern nation-state; the Jews now represented the threat of international conspiracy within the "Christian" nation-state's borders. That prejudice was to go supranational in the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion," supposedly the protocols of a Jewish conspiracy aimed at an international power-grab but in fact a 1905 forgery by Russian secret police in Paris for home consumption at the court of a czar who was perceived as "soft on Jews." The protocols did not turn up in western Europe until 1918–19 (see 15.249n).

The shift in the 1880s from the term *anti-Jewish* to the term *anti-Semitic* was a foretaste of just how sinister this new wave of persecution was to become. The term *Jewish* means a people with a specifically religious identity, if dispersed among many nations. The idea of religious commitment and belief thus implies the possibility of change and reform, including renewal of faith and new idealism. *Semitic* (which refers to the ancient Babylonians, Assyrians, and Phoenicians as well as Arabs and Jews) suggests instead a racial identity—complete with the nineteenth-century assumption that each race had biologically innate characteristics that dictated a predetermined racial superiority, mediocrity, or inferiority. The biology of race held that individuals could behave variously, but only in very limited ways because racial characteristics (what we would call stereotypes), while they could be controlled or held in check, could never be eradicated.

Anti-Jewish prejudice in Great Britain and Ireland was not nearly as virulent as on the Continent, but it was certainly alive and well at the beginning of this century, in the stereotypes of the Jew as anti-Christian and as cupidity personified and in vituperative language and derogatory epithets, such as sheeny and Jewboy in England and Jewman in Ireland. And there was an abundance of caricature imagery, from Dickens's Fagan in *Oliver Twist* to Ikey Moses in *Ally Sloper's Half-Holiday,* a London illustrated weekly (see 9:607n).

As a result of the New Exodus from eastern Europe, "the number of Jews in England, estimated in 1880 at 65,000, more than trebled by 1905,"[11] amounting to approximately 0.6 percent of the population of England. In Ireland the Jewish population increased about eightfold, from 472 in 1881 to 3,769 in 1901,[12] but the 3,769 amounted to only 0.08 percent of the population of Ireland.

In 1906 Edward Raphael Lipsett, a Jew residing in Dublin, published his impressions of what it was to be Jewish in Ireland at the beginning of this century:

> You cannot get one native to remember that a Jew may be an Irishman. The term "Irish Jew" seems to have a contradictory ring upon the native ear; the idea is wholly inconceivable to the native mind. . . . Irish Jews feel that if they spoke of each other as Jewish Irishmen,

8 Harold Frederic, *The New Exodus: A Study of Israel in Russia* (New York, 1892). The book was forceful enough that Frederic was banned as *persona non grata* in Russia, and since Frederic was the London correspondent for the *New York Times,* the ban was extended to all of that newspaper's reporters.

9 Alfred Dreyfus (1859–1935), a Jewish officer in the French army, was arrested in October 1894 on charges of conveying military secrets to a foreign power. He was tried in secret and convicted on the basis of evidence that proved ultimately to have been forged. Retried in 1899 by court-martial, he was again (and somewhat evasively) found guilty. Dreyfus was finally declared innocent and vindicated in 1906, but an abiding, and well-founded, suspicion of anti-Semitism in the military and in the government was not that readily allayed.

10 Martin Luther's accusations, although wild, were more or less typical of his time and were shared alike by western Catholicism and Russian orthodoxy: that Jews were guilty of the "blood libel," of desecrating the host, and of sucking the teats of sows. Mr. Deasy's summary dismissal of the Jews in *Ulysses* is that accusation drawn mild: "They sinned against the light" (2.361 [34:3]).

11 Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1964), p. 270.

12 Louis Hyman, *The Jews of Ireland: From the Earliest Times to the Year 1910* (Shannon, Republic of Ireland, 1972), p. 160.

> it would meet with a cutting cynicism from the natives that the two elements can never merge into one for any single purpose. . . . The Jews understand the Irish little; the Irish understand the Jews less. Each seems a peculiar race in the eyes of the other; and, in a word, the position of Jews in Ireland is peculiarly peculiar.[13]

Louis Hyman prefaces this quotation from Lipsett with the remark: "The mere concept of the Irish Jew raised a laugh in the Ireland of Joyce's day"; and he sums up: "Lipsett's impressions may have truly represented the situation of Jews in the unsympathetic social climate of Ireland at the turn of the century, at best grudgingly neutral to them and at worst openly hostile."[14]

The want of sympathy in that social climate extended in less overt but no less demeaning ways to women. Dublin and Ireland were dominated by the cult of the aggressive and competitive male—a dominion both sustained and dramatized by a pub culture that was essentially *for men only.*[15] Women had little place in the public and political life of the city, and the exceptions, such as Lady Augusta Gregory and Maud Gonne, were upper-class exceptions who proved the rule. If Dublin women did take to the streets in political protest, it was not to fight for votes for women and women's rights as their London sisters were doing, but for Home Rule for Ireland.

A middle-class woman's horizons in Dublin at the beginning of this century were severely limited. Apart from marriage or a convent there were precious few careers open to her, and some of those, such as clerking in a shop or going into domestic service, implied a loss of social status. If she were skilled, dressmaking and millinery were open to her. With some vocational schooling (a relatively new idea), she might become a typist, a stenographer, or even (though rarely) a secretary. If educated, she could seek employment as a governess, companion, or teacher, but one statistic reveals how very limited that alternative apparently was: of the 3,409 students enrolled in colleges and universities in Ireland in 1901, only 91 (2.66 percent) were women. Molly thought that it would be a good idea for Milly to attend Skerry's "shorthand, typewriting, and commercial college" (see 18.1006n) instead of being apprenticed to a photographer as Bloom insisted. And yet Milly's career as photographer, following in the footsteps of her grandfather's cousin, would have made her unique among young women in Ireland.

Marriage itself was by no means something that could be expected in due course. After the Great Famine of the 1840s the population of Ireland declined, and it continued to decline well into the twentieth century. The birth and marriage rates declined, and the average age at which people married rose into the mid-thirties. In 1901 more than 80 percent of men between twenty-five and thirty years of age and more than 60 percent between thirty and thirty-five were unmarried; of the women of marriageable age in the population (fifteen years of age and older), 52.7 percent were unmarried, 37.7 percent were married, and 9.6 percent were widowed. The percentage of unmarried increased from 47.7 percent in 1881 to 50.8 percent in 1891, and to 52.7 percent in 1901.[16] These are very high rates, and they mean that young women like Gerty MacDowell could have little hope—or even consolation, unless one regards a twenty-two-year-old woman's daydreams of romance with a sixteen-year-old boy (she a Catholic and he a Protestant in *that* Ireland) as some consolation.

For most women the only alternative was some form of dependency: in a convent, in the homes of parents or near relatives. Even if employed, women were generally regarded as "temporary employees" and were not paid wages that would enable them to be self-supporting, on the assumption that they would live at home and contribute to the family purse.

A Note on Monetary Values[17]

Joyce uses monetary values (among other incidental "hard facts") as indicators of and clues to

13 Quoted in ibid., p. 176.

14 Ibid, p. 176.

15 The pub as *mise-en-scène* is everywhere in *Ulysses:* Davy Byrne's in Lestrygonians, the bar of the Ormond Hotel in Sirens, Barney Kiernan's in Cyclops, and Burke's at the end of Oxen of the Sun. These are all but matched as pub environments by the carriage in Dignam's funeral procession (no women at the funeral?), by the newspaper office in Aeolus, by the librarian's office in Scylla and Charybdis, by the residents' and interns' commons room in the National Maternity Hospital in Oxen of the Sun, and by the cabman's shelter in Eumaeus. Even the brothel in Circe seems to enjoy its version of pub atmosphere.

16 "Statistics of Ireland," in *Thom's Official Directory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland for the Year 1904* (Dublin, 1904), p. 688.

17 The pound (£) is still the basic monetary unit of the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland,

his characters' attitudes and status. Since Joyce's technique dictates that he withhold evaluatory comment, these clues can easily be overlooked or misinterpreted. The value of money in 1904 Ireland (or in any country foreign in space and time) presents difficult problems for the reader. Stephen, for example, receives a monthly salary of three pounds, twelve shillings (£3 12s.; 2.221 [30:6]). A direct and rough approach to translation would suggest that in 1904 the dollar was worth at least five times what it is worth in 1985; thus, the pound, worth $5 in 1904, would be worth $25 in 1985, and so Stephen's monthly wage would amount to $90. The school does not provide Stephen with bed and board, so in those terms $90 implies a grinding poverty. However, a somewhat different line of calculating exchange rates leads to quite different answers. *Thom's Official Directory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland* (Dublin, 1904), p. 1345, lists the Dublin market prices of four Irish staples: bacon, bread, potatoes, and oatmeal.[18] A comparison of those 1904 prices with today's prices gives the British penny (1904) the buying power of about 45¢ (U.S., 1985). In these terms Stephen's salary translates into a respectable, if modest, $388.80.

But the relation of money to everyday life was quite different in 1904 Dublin from what it is in the United States in 1985. Dubliners then did not face the range and variety of consumer goods or the pressures to spend that so influence the meaning of money in 1985. In effect, staples were much closer to the backbone of a family budget in 1904 than that vague yardstick, "standard of living" (with its central heating and air-conditioning, automobiles, household appliances, leisure expenses, vacations, and so on), implies in 1985.

This suggests that Stephen could live quite comfortably within his income. It also suggests that his behavior with money is not mildly but wildly prodigal on 16–17 June 1904. He sets out with £3 12s., and at the end of his day of pub crawling Bloom returns £1 7s. to him from safekeeping (17.1475 [711:33]). This does not count the half-crowns (2s. 6d.) Stephen discovers in his pocket (16.191–94 [618:11–14]), one of which he lends to Corley. Assuming he had two half-crowns left (5s.), he ends the day having spent roughly £2, or, using the price of staples as a measure of exchange, over $200 (1985). Considered in this way, the evidence relates strikingly to Stephen's larger financial dilemma: his total indebtedness, not including "five weeks' board" (2.255–59 [31:1–5]), amounts to £25 17s. 6d.—in other words, he owes a bit more than he could earn in seven months.

Bloom's financial situation also undergoes a significant change if we view it in a similar manner. Bloom's Dublin contemporaries are dubious about his financial state, and as readers we might accept their doubts if we neglected the evidence given in the novel and if we undervalue the currency. In the financial terms of his time, Bloom enjoys a relatively secure, though of course not affluent, position in the middle class. He has savings of £18 14s. 6d. (17.1863 [723:10]), more than five times Stephen's monthly wage and, since Bloom's house is valued at an annual rent of £28, sufficient to pay his monthly rent for at least eight months. In terms of the relative value of staples, Bloom's 1904 savings would be worth about $2,000 in 1985; his rent, about $250 per month. Bloom receives a commission from the *Freeman's Journal* for £1 7s. 6d.—more than half a month's rent and roughly equivalent to $150. His endowment insurance policy will be worth £500 ($53,000 in staples?) when it matures. His stock holdings have a face value of £900 ($95,580?) and would give him an annual income of £36 ($3,825). Inevitably distorted as they are, these figures do not suggest that Bloom is financially insecure, but that he is at least holding his own.

To hold one's own was no mean feat in the Dublin middle-class world of 1904. One serious side effect of British economic (in effect, anti-industrial) policy for Ireland was the economic disenfranchisement of the Irish middle class.

---

but the units that make up the pound have been changed in both countries. In 1904 twelve pence (12d.) made a shilling (1s.); twenty shillings, a pound. In 1904 fashionable shops and services quoted their prices in guineas (now discontinued): a guinea was £1 1s. or 21s.

18 Bacon was 7d. (sevenpence) a pound in Dublin, 1904; a comparable lean or Canadian bacon in the United States (1985) would be at least $3.00 a pound, making the British penny (d.) worth 43¢. Bread, 5½d. for a four-pound loaf in 1904; U.S. 1985, $2.36: d. = 43¢. Potatoes, .36d. per pound in 1904; U.S. 1985, 25¢: d. = 69¢. Oatmeal, 1.8d. per pound in 1904; U.S. 1985, 39¢: d = 22¢. Average: one penny (1904) = 44.25¢ (1985); or one shilling (1904) = $5.31 (1985); or one pound sterling (1904) = $106.20 (1985). These figures may seem way out of line; yet even when we adjust them by recognizing that food was heavily subsidized in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in 1904, we still have to take into account a profound change in monetary values (as well as in the meaning of money) in the last eighty years.

Outside of the church, law, medicine, civil service, and merchandising, there was precious little employment for members of the middle class, and the number of Bloom's contemporaries who are on their way down (and out) in the novel is not only testimony to Joyce's disaffection with middle-class Dublin, it is also a function of the hard realities that were the conditions of that Dublin world.

Don Gifford

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS
1 JUNE 1985