

II

JOSEPH VALENTE

Joyce and sexuality

The early life and career of James Joyce unfolded during a turbulent period in the history of sexuality in the United Kingdom. A cluster of sometimes competing cultural and scientific discourses emerged to catalogue, diagnose, and explain a broad spectrum of human sexual expression. At the same time, a series of explosive events (the Dublin Castle Affair, the Cleveland Street Scandal, the trials of Oscar Wilde, the rise of the New Woman) turned certain less approved elements of that spectrum into matters of mass spectacle and contention.¹ A fundamental if contradictory mutation in the enlightened sexual attitudes of the time occurred in response to these developments. There was an increased awareness of the irrepressible varieties in sexual practices and preferences among individuals and across cultures. But there also arose a closely related desire to limit such variation, manifest in a concerted effort to establish traditional standards of sexual practice as interiorized norms of sexual desire and identity. With its long-standing cultural privilege newly enhanced by its importance to nation and empire building, reproductive heterosexuality became a truly ‘compulsory’ touchstone in this regard: other erotic modalities were not only treated as deviations from but distorted replicas of this libidinal regime.² To take the most salient example, the widely accepted ‘inversion’ model of homosexuality – the notion of a woman’s soul trapped in a man’s body or vice versa – referred all same-sex desire not to the bodily sex of its bearer, but to the ‘opposite’ gender of the mind, thereby framing it as cross-sex desire at a remove.

The double-edged ideological dynamic sketched here informed and was informed by the landmark texts of psychoanalysis. Freud’s *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* completely detaches the libidinal drive from any proper bodily aim. On the contrary, it pronounces humankind subject to an innate ‘polymorphous’ perversity, concentrated in infancy, and imperfectly amenable to civilizing discipline.³ Freud thus finds the very fulfilment of the reproductive heterosexual norm, the newborn, to be the privileged site of a fundamental and ineradicable resistance to it.

But Freud had also already begun, in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, to elaborate the most powerful modern theory of how such polymorphous perversity grows subject to rule, of how cross-gendered psychosexual identities come to be activated and domesticated within the nuclear family structure. Indeed, the psychologizing of *sexual* identity itself can be seen as an innovation of Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex. It was precisely the triangulated path of oedipal desire that enabled Freud to conceive the twin processes of gender formation and sexual desire as deeply entangled in operation, yet neatly opposed in destination. Under the law of castration, vested in the father, the oedipal subject comes into individual being through an identification with one parental figure that involves aligning him or herself with that parent's sexual desire for the gendered characteristics of the other. At its very inception, then, the oedipal subject is not only sexed but *heterosexual*, and far from disturbing this regulatory configuration, homosexuality consolidates it by 'inverse' repetition, merely transposing the normative coordinates of gender identification and erotic object-choice dictated by the sex (male or female) of the body.

Joyce's major fictions are characterized by the same dialectical interplay between highly labile erotic currents and stabilizing sexual convention, between affective anarchy and normative constraint. In this respect, the structuring principles of Joyce's treatment of eroticism, and the eroticism of that treatment, seem entirely consonant with the historical and intellectual context of his literary production. But his art embodies more than the sum or the symptom of his cultural determinations. From the self-betraying lyricism of *A Portrait of the Artist*, to the psychic transcription of *Ulysses* and the impacted dream-script of *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce's experiments in writing the psychosexual, in the sense of both narrative and stylistic enactment, intervened decisively in the discursive milieu that shaped them. Bridging the gap between literary adaptation and theoretical invention, Joyce's work succeeded in reshaping the sexological accounts with which he began and from which he never entirely departed.

Sex as perversion

The distinctive contribution that Joyce made to the modern anatomy of sexuality lay in his reversal of the received order of genetic priority between sexual impulse and sexual interdiction, his rebuttal of the widespread assumption that erotic desire takes shape prior to and independently of the social restraints laid upon it. In certain respects, his vision anticipates Michel Foucault's much celebrated post-modern interrogation of 'the repressive

hypothesis'.⁴ According to Foucault, the Victorian prohibitions on sex were far from finalities in themselves. Sexual desire did not simply fall prey to secrecy and prohibition; it was aroused by prohibition and exploited by secrecy as a renewable resource for social management. Joyce's analysis of the late Victorian strictures on homosexuality proceeds on these lines. In his essay, 'Oscar Wilde: The Poet of Salome', written just as he undertook the revision of *Stephen Hero* into *A Portrait of the Artist*, he pronounces Wilde's notorious sexual errancy to be 'the logical and inevitable product' of the sexual 'secrecy and restrictions' endemic to British public schools (OCPW 150). The narrative structure of his more finished *Bildungsroman* follows up on this insight. The Clongowes smuggling scandal retroactively triggers Stephen's disavowed homoerotic impulses, transfiguring previously charged signifiers ('suck', 'hot and cold cocks', Mooney's 'creamy sweets') into subliminal foretokens of the protagonist's maturing sexual ambivalence. Through this temporal kink in the linear *Bildung* plot, Joyce underlines the systematic tendency of social proscriptions to engender the internal states and even the outward expressions that they propose to eliminate.

Unlike Foucault, however, Joyce found the seductive effects of sexual sanction to be an essential condition of eroticism itself. The initial thunderclap of *Finnegans Wake* registers this lesson in the cosmic dimension. Established Irish-Catholic folklore associated the roar of thunder with the voice of God calling man to account for the Fall, which was typically assumed to be a violation of a sexual injunction. But the first thunderclap in *Finnegans Wake* induces the fall of the hero rather than indicting the offender: 'The fall (bababadalgharaghtakamminarronkonnbronnton-nerronntuonnthunntrovarrhounawnskawntoohooorderenthurnuk!) of a once wallstrait oldparr is retaled early in bed and later on life down through all christian minstrelsy. The great fall of the offwall entailed at such short notice the pftjschute of Finnegan, erse solid man' (3.15–20). In terms of the physical comedy, the fall of Tim Finnegan, who also figures as Humpty Dumpty, appears consequent to the 'great fall' of the 'offwall' he is building, a calamity wrought by the thunderword itself. So far as the moral allegory goes, the destroyed wall is a sign of Finnegan's own rectitude, the 'wallstrait' character of an 'erse solid man,' now reduced, by the explosive voice of God's law, to an embodiment of incontinence ('oldparr').⁵ Just as the thunder brings about the fall, so the moral tenor of the thunder brings about the weakness of the flesh.

The implications of Joyce's conception of the law as original sin, as primary stimulus to lapsed sexual desire, has a number of striking, politically

momentous implications both for the means of erotic production and the nature of the feelings so produced. Whereas Foucault saw historically specific proscriptions inciting the perversions they named, Joyce's more comprehensive model preserves in altered form the Irish Catholic equation of sex and sin, revealing all erotic desire and enjoyment to be irreducibly perverse. Far from conducing to the reinforcement of positive sexual norms, mobilizing such libidinal energy cannot but corrode them from the inside.

Joycean sexual desire is rooted in a law that manifests itself as an indefinite, historically variable series of normative sanctions – for example, on concupiscent, onanism, masochism, voyeurism, necrophilia, exhibitionism, homosexuality, etc. – and charts an endless detour toward a radically censored *jouissance* that is nothing other than the retroactive excitation of that law itself.⁶ As such, desire can have *no* proper or authentic aim, being split in its emergence between an object-relation, what seems to be wanted, and a relation with the mandate that has created the condition of want. Each of these relations is correspondingly split in turn. On the object side, the fulfilment of a desire thus engendered is inevitably coterminous with its frustration; satisfaction is inhibited by the very prohibition, the internalized prohibition, that conditions its possibility. On the side of the law, the dual message of its mandate opens up supplementary strains of gratification (the bliss of submission, the *frisson* of violation) that are not cognate with the object desired but are part of the experience of the law's operation. Under this dispensation, in other words, enjoyment no less than desire is fundamentally perverse: divided and doubled by prohibition, it is ambivalent and yet supercharged, a compressed site of disappointment and surplus pleasure. Whereas psychoanalysis, in the words of Slavoj Žižek holds that 'sexuality strives outward and overflows the adjoining domains precisely because it cannot find satisfaction in itself',⁷ Joyce's major novels broach the more difficult counterproposal that sexuality cannot find satisfaction precisely because it does not exist 'in-itself' but only 'other-in-itself'. Instead of a proper substance, sexuality possesses only a fractured syntax; it lives in structural antagonism with the variable laws and limits that animate it. Accordingly, the tendency of sexuality to 'overflow the adjoining domains' is no more and no less essential than its tendency to invest or 'cathect' those domains as sites of definition and regulation. It lives 'in excess' of the normative frameworks on which it continues to depend.

This paradoxical structure helps to answer a central question pertaining to Joyce's critical heritage: *how can Joyce's sexual politics be judged as fundamentally conservative and positively revolutionary with equal persuasiveness?* Joycean sexuality emerges as a dual investment in a control structure and in the violation of its boundaries or, to use Joyce's metaphor, in the net

and the flight. The normative framework creates this dual investment, dividing sexual desire between itself and what it forbids, while the dual investment overwhelms the framework, reducing it to a moment in a larger economy. Joyce's literary project is accordingly preoccupied with the dominant conventions of psychosexual constitution and expression, not as fundamentals to be assumed, nor as simple excrescences to be dismissed, but as symptomatic elements in a dynamic of contested enjoyment.

A number of normative frameworks come in for such treatment in Joyce's works, and the most salient bear a close relation to his own erotic singularities, preferences, conflicts, and obsessions. We shall be examining these in turn: (1) the proscription of juvenile eroticism, which bears on both Joyce's youthful experience and his extraordinarily close relation with his daughter, Lucia; (2) the myth of the monogamous couple, which bears on Joyce's jealous interest in sexual betrayal; (3) the myth of the heterosexual family romance, which bears on Joyce's uneasy interest in his own homoerotic feelings. I point up these connections not to introduce a reading of Joyce's sexual representation as confessional, but to indicate that he took that life as a launching point for the literary exploration of sexuality in general. For Joyce, errancy, like error, opened 'portals of discovery' (*U* 9.229).

The myth of childhood innocence

Joyce's fiction contrives to counter the myth of childhood innocence while at the same time implicating adult proscriptions of childhood sexuality in the germination and development of that myth. How is this done? Repeatedly in Joyce's fiction, adult intervention converts the *ambiguously* sexualized stirrings and scenarios of juvenile life into *explicitly* sexual investments and fantasies. We have already noted how the crackdown on 'smuggling' at Clongowes retroactively prompts phobically coloured homoerotic feelings in Stephen, infusing several perceptual cues with unwonted libidinal force. But even earlier, Dante's strictures on his nursery-wish to marry Eileen serve to sexualize that relationship in Stephen's memory, which isolates newly eroticized gestures of friendliness, such as when she 'put her [long, white] hands over his eyes' (*P* 29).

Along similar lines, Bloom's decision to send Milly away to shield her from Molly's affair with Boylan seems to galvanize her sexual initiation by analogy. She writes to Bloom to introduce her new beau in a manner calculated to imply a parallelism between her mother's unmentioned peccadilloes and her present entanglement: 'he [Bannon] sings Boylan's (I was on the pop of writing Blazes Boylan's) song about those seaside girls. Tell him silly Milly sends my best respects' (*U* 4.408–9). Milly represents the medium of

amorous commerce between Bannon and herself and between Molly, a diva, and Boylan, her manager, to be the very medium connecting the two couples, so that the 'best respects' she sends Boylan betokens a sense of fellowship with him. Noting, in effect, that Bannon now sings Boylan's love songs to her, Milly slyly responds to her exile with the coded warning, 'Like mother, like daughter'. Bloom's reading of the letter confirms her identification of the two cases and thus the effect of his prophylactic strategy in stimulating Milly's sexual appetite.

Parental surveillance and proscription of childhood sexuality activate the youthful libido they aim to curb precisely by introducing and transmitting the dialectical split between sexual desires or practices and the normative regulations they are called upon to observe. That is to say, the sexuality realized through parental restrictions in Joyce is a profoundly riven and so inevitably perverse sexuality. Thus, in *A Portrait*, Dante ostensibly places Eileen off limits to Stephen because her tribe, the Protestants, ridicule the litany of the Blessed Virgin. But Dante's explanation only imbues the phrases 'Tower of Ivory, House of Gold' with sexual energy for Stephen in the context of their association with his now taboo friend. Those liturgical signifiers, in turn, form the site of a dialectical split in his sexual investment between the sacred and profane, the forbidding and the forbidden, sex-denying law and law-defying sex, a split crystallized in his 'shameful' thrill at perfecting the sodality of the Blessed Virgin while 'the savour . . . of a lewd kiss', bestowed by a prostitute, still 'lingered' on his lips (*P* 88).

At different points in his work, Joyce indicates that this generative fissure not only results from parental interdiction, but may have its start in the parental unconscious. Joyce understood parental interdictions on sexuality to possess an inherently self-referential structure, to recall and repeat, in reverse order, the parents' childhood experience of having sexual energies communicated, reprobated and censored by the adult world, only to be preserved in their own unconscious representations. As such, the parental bans on childhood sexuality are likely to be ambiguously countered in and by their mode of enunciation, which may well resonate with: (a) the parents' subliminal resistance to the law they are laying down, (b) the parents' own censored desires, likewise forged in a parental-filial bond. More than proposing a concrete, interpersonal mechanism whereby sexual prohibition is received as sexual incitement, Joyce's account shows this fantasy-effect to be highly overdetermined. Not only does a repressive sexual law create the underlying condition of desirability, possible deprivation; not only does it generate supplementary sources of potential pleasure involving the subject's double-edged relation to the law and the outlawed object; the law

itself proves double-voiced in its parental transmission, expressing forbidden sexual impulses in the act of forbidding sexual expression.

The palimpsestic method of *Finnegans Wake*, because it allows a kind of narrative multitasking, the invocation of simultaneous and contradictory symbolic actions, seems designed to accommodate the complex role of the parental unconscious in what is, after all, one of the book's main concerns, the development of child sexuality. Let us look at the second version of the Fall, the 'museyroom' (museum/nursery room) episode (*FW* 8–10). We have passed from a mythic hero, Finnegan, the subject of a thunderous divine law, to the already fallen bearer of the paternal law, Earwicker. His properly Victorian surveillance of the nursery for sexual misconduct occasions incestuous misconduct of his own. Having displayed a disciplinary zeal so vehement that the mother, Anna Livia, has attempted to hide her boys behind her skirt (a strategy likewise freighted with sexual overtones), he spies on his schizoid daughter Issy peeing and sets off an antagonistic family romance which, centring on the urinary pun, water-loo, unfolds in a scrambled version of the battle between Wellington and Napoleon. Earwicker himself figures the interdependency of repressive authority and illicit desire: his dress is at once august and carnivalesque ('grand and magentic [magnetic/magenta] in his goldtin spurs and his ironed dux and his quarterbrass woodyshoes and his magnate's gharters and his bangkok's best and goliar's goloshes and his pulluponeasyan wartrews'); his name 'Willingdone' evokes both the omnipotence of divine power and the inexorability of overmastering passion; his means of commanding the familial space, his 'mormorial tallowscoop', condenses references to the Wellington memorial, the telescope, news scoops and waxworks and so can be construed as an instrument of detection in the service of law and tradition and as an instrument identifying the paternal gaze with the erect phallus. The 'tallowscoop' is also denominated a 'Wounderworker', an instrument of phallic sexuality, punishment and (patented rectal) cure all in one,⁸ and it is named 'Sexcaliber hrosspower' after the mythical sword of divinely sanctioned sovereignty and the equally mythic power of the paternal phallus.

Willingdone's signature action in this episode reflects this abrasive doubling. While the 'jinnies' (Issy) are 'making their war undisides the Willingdone', he 'git the band up'. Commonly read as a pun on the French *bander*, to have an erection, the formula can just as easily signify raising a brigade or posse of soldiers, particularly given the operative historical conceit. Willingdone responds *both* lecherously and repressively to what are ambiguously sexual signals from his daughter: whether the jinnies are making water ('war') on the side ('undisides') of Willingdone or 'making war'

on his 'side', in the sense of assaulting his sexual authority, is very much undecided ('undisides'). The effect of Willingdone's policing is to *decide* the jinnies on the sexual expressiveness he seeks to check – from this point on, they are 'making war' in earnest – and to polarize their sexual impulses in obverse proportion to his own conflicting motives.

On one side, during the remainder of the episode, the jinnies resist Willingdone's proscriptive surveillance of their erotic stirrings by mounting a seductive appeal to his voyeuristic predilections. They send him a 'hastings dispatch', the stated purpose of which is 'to irrigate the Willingdone' (9.3), that is, to irritate him, to lubricate and fertilize him, a plainly erotic proposition, and to arrogate him, to seize his volition (the Willing-done). Here, the thrill of transgressing the paternal law, expressed in the cheer 'Yaw, yaw, yaw!' is at once doubled and adulterated by the *jouissance* of surrendering to paternal desire. On the other side, the jinnies resist the Willingdone's prurient, voyeuristic 'advance' by appealing to patriarchal norms of sexual attachment. Their dispatch tells Willingdone to 'Fieldgaze thy tiny frow!' (9.5). Their admonition might be unpacked as 'look *to* your little wife', 'look *at* your little wife', 'take your pleasure gazing at her, not us' – in sum, behave in accordance with the canons of sexual propriety that you would implement. 'That', the text continues, 'was the tictacs of the jinnies for to fontannoy the Willingdone' (9.6–7), that is, their *reverse* tactics for playing his authority off against his passion. They anger him as a subject of desire while arousing him as a defender of law. Here the thrill of defying the sexual will of the father, expressed in the proto-feminist war cry 'Shee, shee, shee!' is at once enhanced and tempered by the more modest pleasure of taking up the mantle of the sexual norm. The jinnies' final manoeuvre in this sequence, 'jillous agincourting [of] all the lipoleums' (Shem and Shaun as Napoleon particles (9.7–8)), neatly combines the two earlier movements: it defies the father's repressive surveillance, goads him to jealousy, provokes his voyeuristic ardour, and presents a generationally appropriate alternative to his incestuous designs. It is truly a strategy for 'making war' as romance and romance as war, agon-courting, and it originates not with the jinnies themselves but with the ambivalent force of the parental unconscious.

The myth of the monogamous, self-enclosed couple

The triangular cast of the jinnies' erotic alliances merely narrativizes the triangulation at work in the genesis of their sexual affections. Their conflicting libidinal investments in Willingdone's legitimate authority and illicit desire are merely reapportioned in their 'agincourting [of] all the lipoleums',

who in different respects constitute both forbidden and relatively legitimate object choices by comparison with the father. The reconfiguration continues in later episodes, in which the brothers themselves occupy the opposed vertices of Issy's romantic triangle, Shem exerting the attraction of a rarefied social ideal, Shem the fascination of the socially abject and unacceptable.

In this regard, Issy's developing psychosexual economy forms an infantile prototype of the structure of sexual affinity in Joyce's fiction. The erotics of Joyce's narratives seem entirely absorbed in the vicissitudes of the compulsory heterosexual romance; the figure of the cross-gender couple bestrides each of his texts from *Chamber Music* through *Finnegans Wake*. But this law of the couple, upon which Joyce's reputation for traditionalist sexual politics resides, proves notoriously unstable, always opening out upon its own subversion, through the introduction of a third term. Indeed, in Joyce's major works, the featured romantic and sexual affiliations take on an almost exclusively triadic cast. The pattern takes hold quite emphatically with the final three stories composed for *Dubliners*: 'Two Gallants' (Corley, Lenahan, the girl), 'A Little Cloud' (Chandler, Gallaher, Annie), and 'The Dead' (Gabriel, Gretta, Michael). It proceeds through *A Portrait* (Stephen, Emma, Cranly), *Giacomo Joyce* (Giacomo, the student, Nora), *Exiles* (Richard, Bertha, Robert), into *Ulysses* (Molly, Bloom, Boylan; Molly, Bloom, Milly) and explodes in multiple variations throughout *Finnegans Wake*. In every case, the triad disposes itself into a protagonist of desire, a figure of social legitimacy or entitlement, and a some way problematic object of erotic attraction.

The figure of legitimacy may function simultaneously as rival and gender ideal, for example, Cranly for Stephen, Richard for Robert or Boylan for Bloom. In such instances, the official but contested heterosexual romance facilitates and disguises a flow of homoerotic desire, establishing the sort of transferential relation between the two sexual preferences that Eve Sedgwick has theorized as homosociality.⁹ Due in some measure to the influence of her conception, the triangular sexual relations prevalent in Joyce's fictions have commonly been taken to have as their primary purpose the subversion of the culturally sacrosanct homosexual-heterosexual opposition. But as we observed, there is another side to troilism in Joyce. The figure of legitimacy can also embody the socially preferred love-object (Shaun) by contrast to another (Shem), whose appeal derives from the social defiance he enables. Taking the two sides together, we can see that the primary function of troilism in Joyce consists rather in its reproduction, within the domain of adult relations, of the originary fissure on which human sexuality is founded, its rehearsal of the perverse conditions of desire and enjoyment as such: their

simultaneous captivation by and transgression of the normative constraints that incite them.

The myth of the heterosexualizing family romance

That being said, Joyce does tend to interlink and superimpose such homosocial triangles onto oedipal triangles anchored by his juvenile protagonists. The logic of this manoeuvre clearly implies that in mediating the flow of same-sex desire, mature heterosexual competition merely continues the work of the primal scenario of normative heterosexual development, the Oedipus complex. Thus, more than kinship, the relationships that Joyce ultimately proposes between homo- and heteroeroticism is a profound immixture, a mutual adulteration constitutive of their joint possibility.

The primordial bond of hetero- and homoeroticism, in turn, hinges upon a structural anomaly in the Oedipus complex, a crosswiring of its supposedly bipolar components, gender identification and sexual object-choice. As Joyce emphasizes in his representations of children, assuming a gender position involves a libidinal investment in the images, codes, and archetypes of that position. In 'The Sisters', for example, the boy-narrator's identification with the dead 'Father' culminates in his dream of hearing the priest's confession and thereby putting on his institutional authority, expertise and prestige, qualities the boy emulated in the living man. But the dream suddenly changes tone and takes on the furnishings of an Oriental fantasy, something persistently associated in Joyce's Dublin with fervid, forbidden and 'deviant' sexuality. Conversely, a child's oedipal attachment to a parental figure, because it aims so directly at bodily and/or psychic reunification, inevitably comprises a strong element of (cross) gender identification as well. Thus, as Stephen Dedalus moves from *A Portrait* to *Ulysses*, his development increasingly centres on his coming to grips not just with the erotic attachment to his mother that her death has italicized, but with the maternal identification that attachment has left behind. The ghost of his mother precisely objectifies this haunting identification.

Stephen's anxiety on this score arises largely from the previously cited association, among sexual scientists and others, of cross-gender identification with same-sex desire. Freud strengthened the currency of this inversion model by assimilating it to his newly dominant theory of sexual development. His theory appends the Oedipus complex as an explanatory clause of the heterosexual contract and, by the same token, maintains homosexuality as a carbon copy of this document – its reversed negative facsimile. Even as Joyce recirculates the inversion paradigm as a dramatic basis for

the anxieties he wishes to anatomize, he maps the originary split of law and desire onto the nexus of gender identification and sexual preference, and thus offers a critique of Freud's oedipal model. On one side, as with the boy's emulation of the priest in 'The Sisters', Joyce shows how normative gender identification entails an inescapable eroticizing of the gender position itself, hence a certain deviation from the norms of object-preference. On the other, as in Stephen's fixation on his mother, alignment with the law of desire or object-choice entails an internalization of the lost parental image of the opposite sex and so a certain departure from the norm of gender identification. Here again, Joycean sexuality comprises an antagonistic interdependency between impulses to submission and transgression, both of which find always compromised satisfaction at different levels of the libidinal structure.

Finnegans Wake offers the most comprehensive rendition of this dynamic as well, again owing to its hypertextual capacity to elaborate the densely layered communication of the parental and filial unconscious. In the museyroom episode, Willingdone's dual embodiment of legitimate patriarchal authority and illicit paternal desire has significant consequences for his children's negotiation of the gender/sexuality bind. 'Making war' upon their father, the jinnies not only come into their feminine sexuality, they engage a martial, implicitly masculine gender identification with him. They sign their dispatch 'Nap', short for Napoleon, indicating that at a certain level they take themselves to be 'little men'. And they begin 'agincourting' their *fellow* Napoleons ('the lipoleums') partly on this basis.

For their part, in identifying with the gender law of the father, the lipoleums come into conflict with him as a subject of desire. This is the classic oedipal scenario: the Willingdone and the lipoleums wrangle over rights of (sexual) access to the family women: ALP and the jinnies. To press their claim, 'the lipoleums is gonn boycottoncrezy onto the one Willingdone' (9.8). Needless to say, this militant assault admits another, sexualized construction, immediately endorsed by Willingdone, who once again 'git the band up' (has an erection, raises a posse). In identifying with the father that is, the lipoleums register a libidinal investment in his gender position – go 'boycottoncrezy' – which arouses his censored homoerotic interest in them no less than his heteroerotic rivalry with them. The remainder of the episode unfolds in a contest and confusion of oedipal aggression ('the lipoleums in the rowdy howses', 9.22) and Greek love ('the lipoleums is nice hung bushellors', 10.3–4), climaxing when 'the dooforhim seeboy blow the whole of the half of the hat of lipoleums off of the top of the tail on the back of his big wide harse' (10. 19–21). This action conjoins

- (a) military reconnaissance with a kind of reverse voyeurism; the boys subject Willingdone to the kind of doubly motivated surveillance that he conducts on the jinnies;
- (b) a conspicuously violent ambush with an implicitly homoerotic anal penetration – undertaken at much greater length in the ‘Buckley Shot the Russian General’ episode.

Taking these two aspects together, we may think of the lipoleums as aligned with the father’s spatial position, trained competitively with him upon the jinnies, and for that very reason, aligned with the homoerogenous zone of his rear end. The violence of the oedipal aggression, as elsewhere the violence of heterosexual passion, conceals as it admits the expression of homoerotic desire.

Even more than Freud, then, Joyce insisted on the proximity of the oedipal family romance and the inversion model of homosexuality. Freud put the two in a metaphorical relationship, where inversion stood as a negative analogue to oedipal desire. Joyce places them in a metonymical relationship, where they remain fundamentally imbricated in their nonetheless incompatible manifestations. In this manner, Joyce reveals homosexuality, in its dominant construction, to be interior to the law proscribing it, and thus reveals the heterosexual norm, understood as a univocal proposition, to be impossible to fulfil and thus perverse on its face. This move, in turn, goes a long way toward dismantling the foundation of sexual science in his time and our own, the notion of sexual identity, and clearly anticipates the counterdiscourse of queer theory.¹⁰

Perversion as sex

Masochism, it seems fair to say, is the characteristically Joycean mode of perversion: it lends focus to the notorious ‘fuckbird’ letters to Nora, and it takes pride of place in *Ulysses*, not just as an enduring facet of Bloom’s personality, but as the central fantasy-form in the novel’s crowning episode, ‘Circe’. But masochism was not only Joyce’s impulsive fetish, it was also his self-regarding fascination, his way of interrogating the mystery of sexual enjoyment. The reason behind masochism’s saliency for Joyce is that the signature rhetoric of the perversion – wherein Masoch’s own male hero/victims enlist, prompt, direct, and contract with dominating women to commit acts of cruelty – serves to epitomize and theatricalize the precise, ambivalent logic that Joyce discerned in erotic experience generally. It is important to note, in this regard, that if Joyce ‘participated in Masoch’s own space of . . .

masochism',¹¹ he seems to have done so strictly in writing, not in bodily performance. The distinction suggests a consistently *reflective* interest in the ritualized exchange of control and abandon.

In his letters to Nora, Joyce constructs a fantasy scene wherein she is to play both his torturer and his ultimate moral authority, and so in sum, his disciplinarian. At the same time, his prose brims with non-masochistic, but otherwise perverse fantasies about their shared sexual activity. By regularly situating Nora as both 'whorish' object-choice and maternal lawgiver, Joyce is able to unfold the permutations of a libidinal energy conflictually invested in and unevenly inflected by normative boundaries and their anticipated transgression. The masochistic delirium, its 'madness', to use Joyce's term, forms Nora herself, her embodied participation in the erotic scenario, as a taboo object, towards which every express desire is necessarily 'dirtier [and] dirtier' (*SL* 185). The *frisson* of violating the norms of sexual propriety in this wholesale fashion, however, is bound up with and inhibited, even undercut by Joyce's attachment to these norms. At one point, he specifically reminds Nora, 'As you know, dearest, I never use obscene phrases in speaking. You have never heard me, have you, utter an unfit word before others. When men tell me . . . filthy or lecherous stories I hardly smile' (*SL* 182). His Catholic sense of guilt, itself deeply eroticized, at having deviated from the canons of sexual virtue typically expresses itself in a discomfort that in so doing he has violated the object of his desire. His letters reflect with contrite insistence upon his own characteristically masochistic strategy of conscripting Nora into salacious fantasies which, by his own lights, tend to degrade her, and they thereby labour to refute and remove the thrillingly taboo associations that he has himself imposed. To further this end, Joyce adorns her image in a compensatory beatific aura, but by then qualifying her as a 'saint' and an 'angel', he implicitly proclaims her eligibility and even her responsibility to play the part his fantasy most requires of her, moral sovereign and taskmaster. We find Joyce repeatedly apologizing to Nora and demanding chastisement at her hands for the sin of defiling her image in masochistic binges, of which his repentance is but the nominally hygienic continuation.

In this instance, the classic patriarchal splitting of the female love-object into 'whorish' and divine image is put in the service of elaborating the corresponding split in the relationship of sexual desire to the law, i.e. to the moralizing and normalizing limitations placed upon it. Herein lies the enabling paradox of Joyce's masochism. It establishes a fantasy frame of outrage upon respectable sexual morality that is predicated upon utter submission to that morality as embodied, *within the frame*, by the authoritarian woman. As such, masochism not only makes available the joy of abandoning oneself

simultaneously to the electricity of the illicit and to the compelling power of law, but gives rise to each precisely by way of the other and to something else besides, a kind of surplus *jouissance*, in their combination. At the experiential level, the masochistic dynamic results in a self-perpetuating erotic machinery: the imagined punishment reproduces for Joyce the perverse sort of pleasure to be punished and so itself requires still further orgasmic discipline *ad infinitum*. Joyce's missives to Nora not only represent but in a sense perform this cycle, accelerating erotic intensity in inflated, recursive prose interlaced with references to the author's sexual exhaustion. At the hermeneutic level, Joyce's self-reflexive brand of masochism stages and illuminates the core logic of interdependency binding transgressive desire and the desire to comply as they attach themselves to various social sites, registers, and relationships.

That Joyce conceived the analytical potential of masochism in this light seems evident from his delineation of Leopold Bloom's hallucinatory bout of erotic torment in the Nighttown episode of *Ulysses*. In the first instalment of this masochistic revel, Bloom conjures up a bevy of high society ladies whom he has offended with a series of notes exhorting them to commit 'depraved' sexual acts and to punish him for making the suggestion. While the erotic trajectory of his fantasy letters approximates that of Joyce's letters to Nora, class distinction and aspirations contour the terrain on which that trajectory unfolds. This is not to suggest that sexuality in this segment 'overflows' its 'adjoining domains', as Žižek has it, into the register of class politics, but, to the contrary, that sexuality takes class politics as the site of its own complex self-mediation. Thus, in an unconscious recognition of the class determinants of erotic regulation, Bloom's fantasy explicitly identifies sexual with social propriety.

In positioning socially elite women as prospectively willing participants in disreputable sexual activities, from adultery to coprophilia, the letters ventilate a mixture of gender and class aggression redolent of Bloom's earlier comments on the well-heeled lady standing outside the Grosvenor Hotel: 'Careless stand of her . . . Like that haughty creature at the polo match. Women all for caste till you touch the spot . . . Reserved about to yield . . . Possess her once take the starch out of her' (*U* 5.102–6). But Bloom's own respect for caste enters into the fantasy as a successively inhibiting and intensifying factor. He envisions the women's disdain of his prurient advances as resting upon contempt for his class status. Thus Mrs Yelverton Barry snickeringly remarks his 'prentice backhand' script and makes a point of observing that he first saw her in 'a box of the *Theatre Royal*' from the cheap seats or 'gods' (*U* 15.1017–20); the Honourable Mrs Mervyn Talboys simply refers to him as 'a plebeian Don Juan' (*U* 15.1064); Mrs Bellingham claims that

Bloom wrote of envying her coachman his attire and his ‘fortunate proximity to my person’ (U 15.1048). That is to say, just as Bloom’s transgressive pleasure in violating the sexual norm is supplemented by an aggressive pleasure at overstepping class boundaries, so his residual shame at his sexual infractions manifests itself in a sense of class abjection. By the same token, his eager submission to the genteel judgements and rigorous physical discipline of these ladies evinces his respect for the paired canons of social and sexual propriety and thus serves to expiate and even to license his perverse infringements of those canons. But more than that, his act of submission actually *extends* those infringements and their attendant enjoyment as well, requiring – or is it entitling – him to undergo a regimen of flagellation, whose own naughty pleasures invite continuing punishment. Here again we see the enjoyment of transgression and the enjoyment of submission collapse together in a sort of perpetual motion machine, perfectly captured in Bloom’s plea for leniency while he ‘*offers the other cheek*’ of his bum for flogging (U 15.1109).

Bloom’s masochistic surrender, finally, proves a way of recreating the class fantasy that shaped it. Insofar as within the middle classes, social status answers as much to cultural as to economic capital, Bloom’s accession to the society ladies’ strictures on sexual ‘misconduct’ represents an indirect means of furthering his own social promotion, for it suggests his full appreciation of the strictures of aesthetic taste and moral judgement that characterizes the social elite. Bloom’s stated preference for ‘refined birching’ (U 15.1096) not only acts to dissociate himself from the lowly image the ladies have of him, it evokes the hopeful fantasy that his chastisement amounts to a form of participation in their circle. What that participation reveals in turn is that the bourgeois sexual code itself functions as class aggression, forbidding to the lower orders, in the name of morality, the indulgences of their ‘betters’. In a mirror image of Bloom’s class attitudes, his fantasy ladies identify his sexual perversions with his social pretensions and they scourge the latter with a gleeful ferocity that bespeaks their own perverse inclinations:

Tan his breech well, the upstart! (U 15.1091)
 Thrash the mongrel within an inch of his life. The cat-o’-nine tails. Geld
 him. Vivisect him. (U 15.1104–5)
 To dare address me! I’ll flog him black and blue in the public streets. I’ll dig
 my spurs in him up to the rowel . . . (*she swishes her hunting crop savagely in
 the air*) (U 15.1115–18)

Here at the culmination of Bloom’s fantasy, the scene of violent correction, its sexual energies bring their class-coding into spectacular visibility even as their intensity overwhelms all disciplinary control.

A similar dynamic unfolds in the second instalment of Bloom's self-demeaning odyssey – his encounter with Bella Cohen – only in this case the gender system forcefully returns to centre stage as the primary articulation of sexual norms. In Deleuze's now standard reading of masochism as gender politics, the male protagonist-victim confers ultimate authority upon the figure of woman in order to expiate his inborn or ingrained complicity in the patriarchal order of sex/gender regulation or, as Deleuze phrases it, 'his resemblance to the father and the father's likeness to him'.¹² But, as a theoretical matter, the Deleuzian analysis of masochism possesses flaws fatal to a reading of the Bella interlude. It fails to acknowledge how in the psychic economy of masochism, the pain inflicted upon a subservient man by a domineering woman as a reversal of patriarchal hierarchies always also counts as a pain suffered by a man for the act of voluntarily subjecting himself to a woman, for consenting to the disturbance of patriarchal mandates. For this reason, masochism must be seen as a means of paying respect, and therefore reinscribing, the gender law that it exceeds, and the most distinctive features of Bloom's masochistic ordeal in the brothel serve to accentuate and anatomize this double itinerary.

The first of these features is that the dominatrix is not selected, encouraged, instructed or stage-managed by the hero-victim. Within the fantasy, Bloom is constrained, often physically, to obey the inimical figure of Bella and to suffer at her hands. Bloom's fantasy here is one of *enforced submission* to the law. But of course the fantasy of enforced submission is not itself enforced, and Joyce emphasizes as much by having Bloom enter the space of sexual captivity voluntarily: '(cowed) Exuberant female. Enormously I desiderate your domination' (*U* 15.2777). In this way, Joyce ensures that the subsequent hallucination of violent subjugation will be interpreted as belonging to Bloom, in the sense of being the expression of his erotic proclivities and identifications. The female enforcer, accordingly, is no less the embodiment of Bloom's internalized sexual and social norms than the society ladies are, or than Nora was for Joyce. The difference in this case is that Bloom's object choice is not the dominatrix empowered but rather *himself abased*, from which he extracts the perverse *jouissance* of zero-degree powerlessness, a kind of pure self-abandon, and the corresponding norm that he must honour and so receive psychic licence from is none other than force itself. To put it in psychoanalytic terms, in this masochistic fantasy, Bloom's 'imaginary' ego-identification is *as* pathetic wretch; his symbolic superego identification is with the empowered perspective that sees him and treats him as such. The text makes the last point clear from the start –

Joyce and sexuality

BLOOM

(*infatuated*) Empress!

BELLO

(*his heavy cheekchops sagging*) Adorer of the adulterous rump!

BLOOM

(*plaintively*) Hugeness!

BELLO

Dungdevourer!

BLOOM

(*with sinews semiflexed*) Magmagnificence! (U 15.2836–45)

Throughout the remainder of this episode, Bloom punctuates his captive ordeal not with signifiers of consent, which would tend to abrogate the coercion involved, but with signifiers of obeisance, which tend to approve it.

What makes authoritarian force a paramount sexual norm for Bloom and what makes his embrace of sexual enslavement a correspondingly perverse pleasure is of course the patriarchal sex/gender system, which assigns the traits of physical strength and social mastery to masculinity, and the traits of physical delicacy and social docility to femininity. In putting himself at the absolute disposal of anyone, let alone an empowered female, Bloom courts a *jouissance* profoundly identified with the position of woman. Bloom's fantasy thus contravenes the specifically gendered sexual norms upon which it in part depends. Although he continues to worship the historically masculine fetish of irresistible force, he forfeits on his own behalf the masculine possession and privilege thereof.

But this brings us to the second, more conspicuously distinctive aspect of Bloom's fantasy. As it takes on a more violent coloration, there occurs an hallucinatory gender reversal. Bella Cohen morphs into the brutally hypermasculine Bello, who degrades and tortures Bloom, now transformed into a timorous, dependent specimen of girlhood. The virtual transgendering proves a perfect exemplar of Joyce's use of masochism to ratchet the relationship of sexual desire and sexual proscription to a clarifying extreme. On the one hand, the fantasized gender switch is radical and all encompassing; it runs the gamut from an interchange of stereotyped interests and attitudes (for example, Bloom becomes preoccupied with appearance while Bello adopts Bloom's business concerns, evincing a passion for stock investment) to dress and deportment (e.g. Bello wears '*mountaineers puttees*' and smokes a cigar while Bloom dons a 'frock' and '*bangle bracelets*') to the sex of the body itself (e.g. Bloom sports a '*vulva*', which Bello penetrates with his fist). On the other hand, however, operating at the heart of a masochistic fantasy,

the gender translation functions to restore the patriarchal identification of physical prowess, social aggressiveness, and sexual dominion exclusively with the man or, rather, with the attribute of masculinity, while reaffirming the conventional misogynist imputation of a natural dependence, sexual and otherwise, to the feminine, a need to be governed and subordinated. For the cultural imaginary staged in Bloom's fantasy, a sexually masterful woman is a phallic woman, and a sexually submissive man is a girly-man. It is only insofar as she is overtaken, and taken over, by Bloom's projected image of robust masculinity that Bella exercises the requisite authoritarian control to bring Bloom to heel. And it is only in losing his manhood, in introjecting a self-image of shrinking femininity, that Bloom comes to acquiesce in a humiliating *jouissance*. In this fashion, Bloom subscribes to his culture's normative gender typology in the very act of breaking with it.

But I would go further still. Consider the dramatic timing of the gender reversal. Firstly, it occurs just at the moment that the masochistic fantasy intensifies from menacing flirtation to flagellation. Bloom, we might infer, can *only* sustain the perverse enjoyment of his 'crimes against gender' if he expresses, in the unconscious plotting of his fantasy, a psychic fidelity to the patriarchal law of gender in its fundamental sexual aspect. For Bloom, the materialization of sexual dominance entails its masculinization. Secondly, the gender reversal occurs at just the moment when Bloom shifts from participating in the masochistic scenario to feeling himself overwhelmed by the tyrannical power of his tormentor, i.e. when the fantasy becomes one of enforced submission. Paradoxically, no greater respect can be paid to power than *involuntary* respect, respect born of the belief in and a secret identification with its invincibility. That Bloom should evince this summary respect in concert with this mutual transgending implies a still deeper assent to the primary system of sexual constraint, the patriarchal law of gender identity and difference.

By the affective logics we have been sketching in this essay, abject obedience to a figure of sexual regulation within the masochistic fantasy affords compensatory latitude or cover for the perversions at stake in the fantasy itself. Bloom's fealty to Bella-Bello, both as lawgiver and symbolic avatar of patriarchy's law, is virtually absolute: he fantasizes himself obeying under a compulsion whose inexorability his own half-hearted pleas for clemency are meant to adduce. The licence that he garners is correspondingly absolute; indeed, it is mandatory. And since on the terms of the fantasy, Bloom has no choice but to indulge in perverse appetites, he is free to enjoy without responsibility. The licence taken is, accordingly, encyclopaedic as well. As part of the scenario of total duress, he is enabled to recall, imagine, imitate or abide most of the perversions catalogued in the works of contemporary sexologists like

Krafft-Ebing, including exhibitionism, voyeurism, coprophilia, pederasty, fisting, bestiality, cannibalism, various forms of fetishism (leather, lingerie, foot), transvestism, transsexuality, anal sodomy, and the ‘Gomorrhan vices’ of lesbianism.

Among these enforced perversions, pride of place goes to troilism, for this practice answers to the trying centrepiece of Bloom’s entire day, Molly’s tryst with Boylan. Throughout the narrative, Bloom connives at the affair and by the conclusion of the novel, Molly even opines that he had arranged it. The Bello encounter reveals the logic whereby what may have been a traumatic betrayal for Bloom was also the fulfilment of an obscure longing. First, Bloom is reminded of how ‘in five public conveniences he wrote pencilled messages offering his nuptial partner to all strongminded males’ (*U* 15.3034–5). In light of this graffiti advertisement, Molly’s new admirer appears something of an unconscious dream come true. As Bello remarks, ‘I wouldn’t hurt your feelings for the world but there’s a man of brawn in possession there . . . He is something like a fullgrown outdoor man. Well for you, you muff, if you had that weapon with knobs and lumps and warts all over it . . . He’s no eunuch’ (*U* 15.3136–41). The structure of Bloom’s masochistic transactions with Bella/o uncannily repeats itself in relation to his wife’s infidelity. His fantasy enthrones Boylan as a phallic exemplar and, like the ad itself, this paean to the ideal of virility serves to validate Bloom’s departure from the patriarchal norm: his indulgence in the ‘feminine’ *jouissance* of powerlessness and abjection does not defy so much as indirectly affirm that norm, by professing his own incapacity to satisfy its demands.

In Bloom’s subsequent hallucination of the affair itself, which brings the masochistic extravaganza of ‘Circe’ to a climax (in every sense of the word), Boylan bears a certain authority connected with his successful *parade virile*; he stands for something like the law of manhood. Bloom serves Boylan and, by extension, the phallic principle he embodies, acting as his ‘*flunkey*’ (*U* 15.3760) and pander (‘menagerer’ is Bloom’s term (*U* 15.325)), giving him the run of both his house and his wife. For his part, Bloom is repaid with instructions from Boylan to take the tryst as an opportunity for vicarious, voyeuristic satisfaction, orders with which Bloom gratefully complies

BOYLAN

. . . You can apply your eye to the keyhole and play with yourself while I just go through her a few times.

BLOOM

Thank you, sir. I will, sir.

(*U* 15.3788–91)

The interchange epitomizes the logic of Bloom's masochism: cringing homage to a figure of phallic gender norms and the sexual performance they underwrite not only affords permission to deviate from those norms but is already, in effect, that deviation. The remainder of Bloom's fantasy sustains this logic by counterpointing the lionization of Boylan's masculinity (the whores cheer his olympian sexual prowess) with the denigration of Bloom's (Molly reviles him as a 'pishogue' (*U* 15.3778)), which converge in a moment of intense sexual arousal and release:

BLOOM
(*his eyes wildly dilated, clasps himself*) Show! Hide! Show!
Plough her! More! Shoot! (U 15.3814–16)

Joyce thus stages Bloom's masochistic extravaganza as a kind of meta-perversion, which in summarizing the principles of the perverse, brings along the other perversions in its wake. The capaciousness of masochism as a perversion is linked to its status as a microcosm of sexuality *tout court*. Joycean masochism unfolds in what Žižek has called 'the logic of the exception,' whereby marginal or excluded manifestations of a reality can turn out to crystallize the secret of the whole.¹³ Here, a highly non-normative type of sexuality discloses in the form of its enactment the function of normativity within the larger economy of sexuality, its articulation with the desire it pretends to circumscribe. In this light, the indignation that greeted the sexuality in and of Joyce's fiction seem more understandable if no less regrettable. Whereas Freudian theory outraged polite society by situating perversion *within* the structure of the sexual norm, Joyce undertook the still more threatening project of situating the norm within a structure of perversion coextensive with sexuality itself.

NOTES

- 1 The Dublin Castle saw several prominent colonial officials implicated in a homosexual 'ring', and at least one was subsequently convicted. This scandal in turn facilitated passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, with its notorious section 11, which criminalized all homosexual activity. The Cleveland Street Scandal of 1889, in which prominent London aristocrats were convicted of prostituting West End messenger boys, provided the first major test of the Act. The subsequent trials of Oscar Wilde are still perhaps the most famous prosecution of homosexuality in the modern era.
- 2 See Adrienne Rich, *Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence* (London: Onlywomen, 1981).
- 3 Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905) (New York: BasicBooks, 1975), p. 57.

- 4 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, vol. 1 (New York: Vintage, 1978), pp. 36–49.
- 5 Old Parr was an English centenarian accused of incontinence. See Roland McHugh, *Annotations to Finnegans Wake* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), p. 3.
- 6 *Jouissance* signifies intense sexual enjoyment that in shattering the coherence of the ego comprises suffering as well as orgasmic ecstasy; it is a form of pleasure that exceeds itself as pleasure.
- 7 Slavoj Žižek, *The Metastases of Enjoyment* (New York: Verso, 1994), p. 126.
- 8 For the Wonderworker, ‘the world’s greatest remedy for rectal complaints’, see *Ulysses*, 17.1819–21.
- 9 Eve Sedgwick, *Between Men* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
- 10 Since Richard Brown’s landmark *James Joyce and Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), much of the innovative work on sexuality in Joyce has been done in the area of queer or non-normative sexuality. I would refer the reader to the following collections: *Joyce and Homosexuality*, ed. Joseph Valente, a special issue of the *James Joyce Quarterly* 31.3 (1994); *Quare Joyce*, ed. Joseph Valente (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998); *Joyce: The Return of the Repressed*, ed. Susan Friedman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); ‘*Ulysses*’: *En-Gendered Perspectives*, ed. K. Devlin and M. Reizbaum (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999). I would refer the reader to the following books: Derek Attridge, *Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory, and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 59–77; Suzette Henke, *James Joyce and the Politics of Desire* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Sheldon Brivic, *Joyce’s Waking Women* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Garry Leonard, *Re-Reading Dubliners* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991). Finally, I would refer the reader to the following articles: Joseph Valente, ‘A Child is Being Eaten: Mourning, Transvestism, and the Incorporation of the Daughter in *Ulysses*’, *James Joyce Quarterly* 34 (1997), 21–64; Kevin Dettmar, ‘Vocation, Vacation, Perversion’, in *James Joyce and the Fabrication of Irish Identity*, ed. Michael Gillespie (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001), pp. 132–50; Katherine Mullin, ‘“Don’t Cry for Me Argentina”: “Eveline” and the Seduction of Emigration Propaganda’, in *Semi-colonial Joyce*, ed. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 172–200; Roberta Jackson, ‘The Open Closet in *Dubliners*: James Duffy’s Painful Case’, *James Joyce Quarterly* 37 (1999), 83–98; Margot Norris, ‘Shocking the Reader in James Joyce’s “A Painful Case”’, *James Joyce Quarterly* 37 (1999), 63–81.
- 11 Frances Restuccia, *Joyce and the Law of the Father* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 128.
- 12 Gilles Deleuze, *Masochism: an Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty* (New York: George Braziller, 1971), p. 35.
- 13 Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (New York: Verso, 1989), pp. 22–31.