

The “Non-Jewish” Jewish “Anarchist” Bloom in *Ulysses*: The Ideal Irishman*

Hye Ryoung Kil

I. Introduction

It is well known that the central character in Joyce’s *Ulysses* is a Jew, Leopold Bloom, the descendant of Hungarian Jew Rudolph Bloom. A Jewish character being the protagonist for a novel about British Ireland at the turn of the twentieth century has been discussed largely from two perspectives: postcolonial and modernist. In the postcolonial context, the Irish Jew, doubly persecuted in colonial Ireland, can serve as the “third space”—to use Homi Bhabha’s term—through which the hybridity between the oppressor and the oppressed is visualized, and which thereby envisions a possibility of “undoing binaries and adulterating entrenched identities” (Maley 205). In the modernist analysis of *Ulysses*, the Diaspora Jew, racially and culturally ambiguous in the

* This work was supported by the 2020 Yeungnam University Research Grant.

nationalistic world, may represent the modern man whose identity remains an “enigmatic open space,” “perpetually defined and described by others” (Kiberd 347), and thus suggesting “possibilities of Irish self-making” (Davidson, “Why” 679).

Nevertheless, it seems worth exploring why the Irish Ulysses is or has to be a Jew instead of any other non-European outcast who is culturally equivocal, especially when Joyce remarked in a letter to Carlo Linati: “[*Ulysses*] is the epic of two races (Israel-Ireland)” (*SL* 271). What is curious is why Joyce employed a Jewish character for the protagonist in his novel about Ireland, and not why he chose a Jew for his Ulysses. The connection between the Homeric hero and Jewishness has been suggested as the French philologist Victor Bérard’s *Les Phéniciens et l’Odyssée* (1902), to which Joyce referenced in his “notebook for *Ulysses*,” provided him with a “theory of the Semitic origin of the *Odysses*” (Reizbaum 26-27). Yet, Ulysses the Homeric hero, being a figurative expression for the “unconquered hero” Bloom (*U* 11.342), the latter’s Jewishness would not seem so critical a qualification for Joyce’s protagonist. It is Bloom’s daily experience in Dublin and his response to it, condensed into one word “unconquered” which presumes vulnerability, that makes him the “perfect, positive metaphor for the modern condition” (Levitt 151). It is true for this reason that Jewishness, representing the cultural ambivalence or vulnerability of “Everyman or Noman” (*U* 17.2008), played a central role “in the creation of modernist fiction” (Linett 250). Bloom is thus regarded as “the archetypal Modernist figure” that represents “all humanity in the twentieth century” (Levitt 146).

It can be said, however, that the Jewish Bloom as the hero of the Irish epic, rather than of the modernist novel, was more of a deliberate choice by Joyce. Of course, there, too, exists a mythic connection between the Phoenicians and the ancient Irish or Milesians, highlighted by the

eighteenth-century Irish mythologist Charles Vallancey, whose theories Joyce cited in a 1907 lecture in Trieste (Nadel 303). Even before Vallancey, “Fenius Farsaigh” as the “link between Israel and the Milesians—between the Hebrew language and Irish” was claimed by Geoffrey Keating’s history of Ireland *Foras Feasa* (1629) (Gifford and Seidman 577), which is elaborated in the “Ithaca” chapter of *Ulysses*: “Fenius Farsaigh, descendant of Noah, progenitor of Israel, and ascendant of Heber and Heremon [Milesians], progenitors of Ireland” (*U* 17.750-51). Moreover, the Gaelic revivalist Douglas Hyde, outlining “the Hebrew genealogy of Breogan, founder of the modern Irish race,” supported the connection between the two races in *A Literary History of Ireland* (1899), which Joyce read (Nadel 303).

Thus, the analogy between the Irish colonized by the British and the Hebrews enslaved by the Egyptians was often used at the time, as famously depicted in John F. Taylor’s speech given at the Trinity College Historical Society in 1901 (Gifford and Seidman 147), which is recited by Professor MacHugh from memory in the “Aelous” chapter:

*It seemed to me that . . . I stood in ancient Egypt . . . listening to the speech of some highpriest of that land addressed to the youthful Moses. . . . Why will you jews not accept our culture, our religion and our language? . . . [H]ad the youthful Moses listened to and accepted that view of life . . . he would never have brought the chosen people out of their house of bondage . . . nor ever have come down . . . bearing in his arms the tables of the law, graven in **the language of the outlaw**. (*U* 7.830-69 my emphasis)*

Significantly, MacHugh’s version of the speech, based on “the pamphlet entitled ‘The Language of the Outlaw,’”¹⁾ was Joyce’s “first choice” when he

1) Taylor’s speech was not written out, although the content was printed the next day in *Freeman’s Journal*. MacHugh’s account is based on Roger Casement’s pamphlet

was “asked in 1924 to record some of the book for Sylvia Beach” (Davidson, *James* 80). Recording “only this speech from all of *Ulysses*,” Joyce even read it “with no hint of irony,” which suggests that despite its hyperbolic element, Joyce “valued [the speech] and its sentiment” (Levitt 149). Naturally, Charles S. Parnell, the leader of the Home Rule movement who died without having achieved the political autonomy of Ireland, evokes Moses who “died without having entered the land of promise” (*U* 7.872). The story of “two old Dublin women” spitting out the plumstones “on the top of Nelson’s pillar” (*U* 7.1004-05), symbolic of Ireland under British rule, is thus called “*A Pisgah Sight of Palestine or The Parable of The Plums*,” which insinuates “Moses [and Parnell] and the promised land” (*U* 7.1057-60).

That said, it can still be argued that the creation of *Ulysses* as the Irish-Jewish epic—instead of a short story dealing with a Dublin Jew, “Mr. Hunter,” for *Dubliners* (*SL* 112)—originates in Joyce’s experience in Europe, specifically Trieste, rather than or on top of the legendary history of Ireland. Joyce was interested in Jews of the present day rather than in the ancient Hebrews whose suffering in modern anti-Semitic Europe still paralleled that of the colonized Irish. More importantly, the Diaspora Jews, particularly those in Trieste—which had been a “center of Jewish assimilation” “for two centuries” with its Jewish population “in public prominence” (*James* 130, 132)—who were assimilated to European culture while remaining (or being defined as) Jewish, suggested a new viable identity for Joyce’s Irish. Moreover, Trieste, an Italian free port under Austrian rule like Dublin under British, served as “a little Ireland” for Joyce “to contemplate with more detachment,” as the Triestine Jewish author Italo Svevo—one of Joyce’s closest acquaintances—

entitled “The Language of the Outlaw,” which was anonymously circulated and appeared in the *United Irishman* in 1906. The title phrase is Casement’s and not Taylor’s. See Hye Ryoung Kil, citing Bender and Casement in “A Broader Nationalism in ‘Cyclops’” (7-8).

notes (qtd. in *James* 132). In addition, most of Triestine Jews, mostly of East European heritage, were ardent Irredentists or nationalists advocating the recovery of Italian territories from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In other words, it can be said that Joyce envisioned that Jews in Trieste, most of them successfully surviving the double oppression in the Austrian Italian city, could make a perfect model for the Irish, who like the Jews belonged to “the most disenfranchised peoples in Europe” (*James* 185). Therefore, Bloom of Hungarian Jewish descent, who eats unkosher “pork kidney” (*U* 4.46) and is “as good an Irishman as [the citizen]” (*U* 16.1132), evokes the image of the Triestine nationalist, secularized or “non-Jewish Jew”—in Issac Deutcher’s term (qtd. in *James* 7).²⁾

In this perspective, this essay intends to examine the Jewishness or rather, non-Jewish Jewishness of Bloom as the ideal Irish identity. For this, references to Jewishness in *Ulysses*, including anti-Semitic remarks imposed on and even internalized by the Jews in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Europe, will be analyzed. Particularly, among many stereotypes assigned to the Jews, that of “anarchist” (*U* 15.1156) will be focused on as a positive quality rather than the destructive image elicited by “the bomb” (*U* 15.1197). This pertains to modern Zionism advocated by Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), who was a non-Jewish or non-*Halachic* Jew himself. Herzl’s Zionism reveals Jewish socialist anarchist tendency, which will be discussed later. Thus it will be argued that Bloom’s assimilated, non-*Halachic* Jewishness, specifically anarchist qualities, is suggested for the Irish to break through the colonial “paralysis” which Joyce declares Dublin is centered on (*SL* 83).

2) Cormac Ó Gráda argues that Joyce’s portrait of Bloom is based on “information garnered during his time in Trieste” as Bloom’s story “fits uncomfortably into the setting” of Irish Jews from East Europe; particularly, the immigrant Jews were “emphatically loyalist” in the early 1900s (22-24), while Bloom is described to have “publicly expressed his adherence” to Irish nationalist programs (*U* 17.1646-49).

II. Anti-Semitism and Jewish Stereotypes in *Ulysses*

It is not coincidental that *Ulysses*, a novel about a Jewish hero, is set against two major anti-Jewish events: the European “Dreyfus Affair” and the Irish “Limerick Boycott.” Dreyfus Affair, surrounding the French-Jewish army captain Alfred Dreyfus’s alleged treason of leaking military secrets to Germans, was a crisis dividing the entire French public between the pro- and anti-Dreyfus groups—the latter mainly anti-Semitic—for over a decade from the mid-1890s. It was still a hot issue, with “a host of articles and placards” calling for “violence against Dreyfus and the Jews” (*James* 89), when Joyce briefly stayed in Paris in 1902; Stephen recalls, “M. Drumont, famous journalist, Drumont” (*U* 3.230-31), who was the “central voice of the most volatile period of anti-Semitic activity in France” (*James* 93). In fact, Joyce read about the Affair earlier in Dublin, including a translation of the “notorious open letter *J’accuse* (1898)” by Émile Zola (*James* 62), in which the writer attacked the French army for concealing its mistake about the Jewish captain. Zola died right before Joyce arrived in Paris and at his funeral, attended by thousands, Anatole France delivered an eloquent speech; the “connection between Zola, France, and Dreyfus” may have firmly fixed the Affair in Joyce’s mind (Ellmann 373). The Dreyfus case, provoking the long-debated “Jewish question” in Europe, was never settled to those who viewed “the Jews as a threat” to “all nationalisms” (*James* 128).³ Thus, John Wyse asks Bloom at a Dublin pub, “Do you know what a nation means?” and the citizen says, “What is your nation if I may ask?” while Bloom declares, “Ireland. . . . I was born here. Ireland” (*U* 12.1419, 1430-31).

3) Although a civilian court of appeals rehabilitated Dreyfus in 1906, the army “did not publicly declare his innocence until 1995.”

See <https://www.britannica.com/event/Dreyfus-affair>.

Anti-Jewish activities were not limited to the Continent as Joyce’s Ireland was also experiencing “one of the more violent expressions of anti-Semitism in Irish history” in the city of Limerick (*James* 37). The incident was instigated by a Father Creagh’s anti-Semitic sermons in 1904, accusing the Jews of attempting to overthrow the Catholic Church, which led to the “stoning of Limerick Jewish shopkeepers and their homes” followed by “a two-year boycott of the city’s Jewish-owned businesses” (*James* 37). The Limerick affair manifested the Irish’s prejudice and persecution of the Jews, contrary to Mr Deasy’s remark that Ireland “has the honour of being the only country which never persecuted the jews” (*U* 2.437-38). Concerning the affair, Michael Davitt, the leader of Irish Land League, defended the Jews in a letter sent to *Freeman’s Journal* in January 1904: “The Jews have never done any injury to Ireland. Like our own race, they have endured a persecution, the records of which will forever remain a reproach to the ‘Christian’ nations of Europe. Ireland has no share in this black record. Our country has this proud distinction” (qtd. in *James* 38). Then, Deasy’s remark seems an “ironic” expression of Davitt’s claim, as Davidson notes (*James* 38), that Ireland had never persecuted the Jews, which implies that the Parnellites such as Davitt supported them. Besides, Deasy adds, “Do you know why? . . . Because she never let them in,” which is followed by “a coughball of laughter leap[ing] from his throat”; he playfully repeats, “She never let them in,” “coughing, laughing, his lifted arms waving to the air” (*U* 2.439-46). Deasy is obviously making a joke, which is true though as a “metaphor for Jewish exclusion from Irish society” (Reizbaum 38).

As previously noted, anti-Semitism was prevalent in Europe, including the British Isles, at the turn of the century. European Jews and antagonism toward them have long been persistent as Joyce himself mentioned that anti-Jewishness is “one of the easiest and oldest prejudices to ‘prove’” (qtd.

in Ellmann 709). Yet “anti-Semitism,” which was coined by the German writer Wilhelm Marr in 1879, as “a separate set of prejudices from those of Christian anti-Jewishness” (*James* 85), was promulgated in response to the rise of nationalism throughout the Continent. Particularly, Pope Leo XIII (1879-1903), urging Catholic nations to support new regimes, began his Papacy with a crusade calling for “all Catholics to join the fight against Socialists, Freemasons, Jews, and a host of other enemies of the Church” (*James* 54). While the “oldest Catholic discourse” of the Jews as a “sinful people” perpetuated, antagonism was reinforced toward the Jews as “conspiring against the Christian world in collusion with both the Freemasons and the forces of socialism” (*James* 18). In this context, Bloom is suspected or assumed to be a Freemason in *Ulysses*. Nosey Flynn is sure: “He is in the craft. . . . Ancient free and accepted order. He’s an excellent brother. Light, life and love, by God. They give him a leg up. I was told that by a — well, I won’t say who” (*U* 8.960-64). The citizen refers to Bloom: “What’s that bloody freemason doing?” (*U* 12.300). In “Circe,” Bloom is described as “*giv[ing] the sign of past master,*” “*mak[ing] a masonic sign*” or placing “*his fingers at his lips in the attitude of secret master*” (*U* 15.2724, 4298, 4955-56). Even in Molly’s midnight contemplation, Bloom appears as a Freemason: “the jesuits found out he was a freemason” or “soon out of the Freeman too . . . on account of those Sinner Fein or the freemasons” (*U* 18.381-82, 1226-27). These references signify that anti-Semitic attitudes adopting Jewish stereotypes, such as Freemason, often internalized as revealed by Molly’s thoughts, were widespread in Catholic Dublin.

Furthermore, the sudden influx of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, escaping Russian pogroms against Slavic Jews in the 1880s, contributed to fostering anti-Semitism in the West. In London, where “by 1890 some 30,000 Jews had congregated in the East End” (Knepper 296), the Jewish immigrants

were linked with “criminality, poverty, and anarchism” especially after the notorious Whitechapel murders in 1888 (Knepper 297). In fact, the Jews were stereotyped as all the forces opposed to nationalist politics, supported by the Catholic Church. Particularly, the criminal image of the Jews was solidified by the unsolved murders committed in the impoverished Whitechapel district by “Jack the Ripper,” persistently rumored to be “Jacob the Ripper,” the Jew (Knepper 298). Bloom is thus “wanted” as “Jack the Ripper” in the fantasy chapter (*U* 15.1153). His late father is rumored to have “perpetrat[ed] frauds” (*U* 12.1580-81). Moreover, a crime involving a Jewish scammer, the “Canada swindle case” (*U* 7.383, 12.1084) or “Emigration Swindle” (*U* 16.1241), is repeatedly mentioned throughout *Ulysses*. A man known as “James Wought alias Saphiro alias Spark and Spiro” is on trial for swindling peasants “from the county Meath,” including “his own kidney,” “an ancient Hebrew Zaretsky or something” (*U* 12.1086-92). The recurring references to the Jewish swindler case, again, suggest anti-Semitic prejudices prevalent in Catholic Ireland.

In fact, the number of Irish Jews increased proportionally to that of Jewish immigrants arriving in Great Britain. Especially in Dublin where more than 2,000 Jews resided in 1904,⁴ “fear of more Jews entering [the] economically depressed [capital city]” “buttressed papal anti-Jewishness” in many Catholics as they still struggled with the after-effects of the Great Famine (*James* 20). Accordingly, going back to the Limerick Boycott, Arthur Griffith, the leader of Sinn Féin nationalism, defended Father Creagh in his *United Irishmen* in April 1904:

In all countries and in all Christian ages he, “the Jew” has been a usurer and a grinder of the poor. The influence he has recently acquired in this country is a matter of the most serious concern to the people. In Dublin

4) In 1871, the number of Jews in Ireland had been 285 and in 1881, 453, which had increased to 3,371 by 1904 (Reizbaum 38).

half the labourer population is locked in his toils. Father Creagh deserves the thanks of the Irish people for preventing the poor of Limerick being placed in a similar predicament. The Jew in Ireland is in every respect an economic evil . . . and he remains among us, ever and always an alien. (qtd. in *James* 70)

Not only did he support the priest who had incited riots in Limerick, as Molly rightly suspects that “it must have been [Griffith] he knew there was a boycott” (*U* 18.386-87), but he accused the Jew of being “a usurer and a grinder of the poor,” “an economic evil” in Ireland as “in all countries and in all Christian ages.” The Jew as “usurer” is probably the longest-held and most popular prejudice. Reuben J. Dodd, a parsimonious Dublin solicitor, is described as “of the tribe of Reuben” (*U* 6.251) and “gombeen man” in *Ulysses* (*U* 10.890), the former implying “Jewish,” specifically “Judas” the betrayer, and the latter “usurous” (Gifford and Seidman 110, 278); Dodd appears as “blackbearded Iscariot,” even “Reuben J. Antichrist” in “Circe” (*U* 15.1918, 2145).⁵ Griffith also defines the Jew as “ever and always an alien,” excluded from Irish nation. Griffith’s anti-Jewish nationalist sentiment is vividly manifest in the citizen’s remark about Bloom: “Those are nice things . . . coming over here to Ireland filling the country with bugs . . . swindling the peasants . . . and the poor of Ireland. We want no more strangers in our house” (*U* 12.1141-51); “Beggar my neighbour is his motto” (*U* 12.1491); “Saint Patrick would want to land again at Ballykinlar and convert us . . . after allowing things like that to contaminate our shores” (*U* 12.1671-72).

Griffith’s *United Irishmen*, which spoke for a post-Parnell nationalist

5) Dodd was not Jewish in real life, yet his demand for payment on the debts John Joyce owed him, which was the reason young Joyce went on a trip to Cork with his father—a scene fictionalized in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*—angered John, who most likely referred to Dodd as a “gombeen man” or “the Jew” (*James* 58-59).

movement focused on the revival of Irish economy, began with anti-Jewish propaganda to provoke anti-English sentiment in 1899: “The exclusion of Jews in Germany, Russia, and Austria has nothing to do with religious beliefs. It is rather a question of Patriotism. The Jew has at heart no country but the Promised Land. He forms a nation apart” (qtd. in *James* 69). Griffith’s attitude agrees with the nationalist anti-Semitism which caused the Jewish migration from East European countries, designating the Jew as racial alien and subversive of the national economy. Such anti-Semitism is echoed by the English Haines saying, ‘I don’t want to see my country fall into the hands of German jews either. That’s our national problem, I’m afraid, just now” (*U* 1.666-68), and elaborated by Deasy: “England is in the hands of the jews. In all the highest places: her finance, her press. And they are the signs of a nation’s decay. Wherever they gather they eat up the nation’s vital strength. . . . [T]he jew merchants are already at their work of destruction. Old England is dying” (*U* 2.346-51). Here, Stephen responds that “a merchant is . . . one who buys cheap and sells dear, jew or gentile, is he not?” (*U* 2.359-60), which evokes Davitt’s passages in the same letter cited earlier, as Davidson notes: “Are not historical condition and centuries of deliberate oppression . . . answerable for the Hebrew predilection to profit-seeking by other than the methods of immediate production? And are the gentiles . . . so much above the doctrine and practice of the commercial greed of buying in the cheapest, and selling in the dearest, market?” (qtd. in *James* 37).

In this respect, Griffith’s nationalism, which initially supported modern Zionism as nationalism and then treated individual Jews as parasitic outsiders, demonstrates “the historical split in the perception of the Jew” in modern Europe (Reizbaum 39). Joyce, though interested in Griffith’s Sinn Féin movement, criticized anti-Semitic elements in his paper, as he wrote in 1906: “At least [Griffith] tries to inaugurate some commercial life for Ireland. . . .

What I object to most of all in his paper is that it is educating the people of Ireland on the old pap of racial hatred whereas anyone can see that if the Irish question exists, it exists for the Irish proletariat chiefly” (*SL* 110-11). Joyce approved of Griffith’s economic program, which may be the reason that Bloom, with many business ideas (*U* 16.499-568, 17.1710-43), is “going about with some of them Sinner Fein” and the “coming man Griffiths” (*U* 18.383, 386). Although rumor has it that “Bloom gave the ideas for Sinn Fein to Griffith” and that “he drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system” (*U* 12.1574, 1636), it is doubtful that Bloom actually served as Griffith’s adviser given Sinn Féin’s anti-Semitism, which is enunciated by Buck Mulligan, modelled after Oliver St. John Gogarty, Joyce’s youthful friend involved with Griffith’s movement. Gogarty wrote in *Sinn Féin*, previously the *United Irishmen*, in 1906: “I don’t hate the English, for the simple reason I have never met the embodiment of certain British virtues that are self-avowed. . . . I can smell a Jew, though, and in Ireland there’s something rotten” (qtd. in Reizbaum 36). It is symbolically suggested by the citizen’s “old dog smelling [Bloom] all the time”; “those jewies does have a sort of a queer odour coming off them” (*U* 12.452-53). Mulligan calls Bloom names such as “the sheeny” or “Ikey Moses” (*U* 9.605, 607), defining him as “Greeker than the Greeks” (*U* 9.605), which implies pederasty, and cautions Stephen: “He looked upon you to lust after you . . . thou art in peril. Get thee a breechpad” (*U* 9.1210-11).

As Mulligan insinuates, the sexually deviant or unmasculine Jew, was another prejudice popularly believed, specifically argued by Otto Weininger, an Austrian Jewish thinker. The citizen mocks Bloom’s masculinity, saying, “Do you call that a man?” and doubting his paternity to “two children born” to Molly: “And who does he suspect?” (*U* 12.1654-57). In “Circe,” Bloom is portrayed as a “queer fellow,” “bisexually abnormal,” and a “finished example

of the new womanly man” (*U* 15.600, 1775, 1799), the last phrase “womanly man” borrowed from Weininger’s *Sex and Character* (Gifford and Seidman 481). In the book published in 1903, which became popular after his suicide in the same year at the age of 23, Weininger discussed the “analogies between Jews and women,” which were similar to “misogynistic and anti-Semitic popular culture throughout Europe” (*James* 139). Weininger, a Jew himself, believed that Jewishness was feminine and also self-destructive, which may connect not only to his own but Rudolph Bloom’s suicide in *Ulysses*. “A prime example of Jewish self-hatred” (*James* 142), the Austrian-Jewish author represented Jewish negativity, which was molded into stereotypes assigned to the Jews.

III. The Non-*Halachic* Jew Bloom

It can be said that Joyce was particularly interested in Weininger’s self-abnegation, as “a kind of prototype of the apostate Jew” (Reizbaum 87), which paralleled his own apostasy as the “anti-Catholic Catholic” Irish (*James* 165). In fact, many stereotypes imposed on the Jews were also inflicted on the Irish, particularly contextualized in racial hierarchy: the “simianized Celt” was identified as the “white Negro,” which corresponded to “the Jewish Nigger” (*James* 98). It is not surprising that Bloom is called the “stage Irishman” (*U* 15.1729). He acts or internalizes the role popularly expected of the Jew, as the stage Irishman does what is of the Irish, when he makes a Masonic sign in the nighttown or deems “Reuben J . . . a dirty jew” (*U* 8.1158-59). Similar to the Jews, the Irish were viewed as “amoral or immoral” (Gifford and Seidman 281): Haines says that “the moral idea seems lacking,” talking about “ancient Irish myth” (*U* 10.1082-83). No doubt, as the Jews are

“still waiting for their redeemer . . . so are [the Irish]” oppressed under British rule (*U* 12.1644-45). Meanwhile, “the Irish catholic peasant” is “the backbone of [British] empire” (*U* 16.1021-22), just as the Jew, “accused of ruining,” contributes to the nation’s prosperity: “Spain decayed when the inquisition hounded the jews out and England prospered when Cromwell . . . imported them” (*U* 16.1119-24). In other words, as they say “[w]hen in doubt persecute Bloom” (*U* 15.975-76), “wrongfully accused” or “made a scapegoat of” (*U* 15.762-63, 776), the Jew like the Irish is “Everyman or Noman” (*U* 17.2008) — assumed to be anything by anyone. Jewishness, like Irishness, is “a signifier of [both] insignificance” and “of danger” (Reizbaum 2). It is more than appropriate that Bloom is called “Incog!” (*U* 15.4308), as his actual identity is disguised or invisible.

Self-denial, as “Incog” signifies, was commonly detected among the assimilated Jews while they prospered in their walks of life. Although converted and not Jewish in *Halacha*, the Jewish law, they still remain Jewish or “*Jew-ish*” (Reizbaum 13). That is, they were “non-Jewish Jew” since in Germany and Austria where Jews were most emancipated, the “more assimilated” Jews were, paradoxically the “more virulent” anti-Semitism was (Reizbaum 17). In this sense, “Jewishness” involved “a melancholy pessimism” rooted in “an acute awareness of historical injustice” (*James* 159), evidenced in Bloom’s mentality that may well be identified as femininity, and which connects to Celtic melancholy as the spirit of the Gaelic Revival movement. Thus, Svevo—a pen name of Schimitz—Joyce’s businessman-writer friend in Trieste, mainly dealt with the “Jewish dilemma” in his work, which was to “either convert and suffer self-loathing, or continue to be ‘the wandering Jew’” (*James* 135).

Notwithstanding the dilemma of assimilation, however, European Jews like Svevo were perceived as ideal for a new identity for the Irish. In this Joyce

was “greatly influenced” by “Nietzsche’s characterization of the Jews” which was equivalent to “anti-anti-Semitism” (*James* 116). Nietzsche, whose ideas were widely known in Dublin when Joyce was in college, viewed the Jews essentially as a modern people who had a “political existence separate from their historical identity” and had “developed an acute ‘shrewdness of character’”—often described as “cunning”—“to combat and endure their marginality” (*James* 112-14). Further, the Jews, “above nationalism and religious sectarianism,” were fit to form a “superior ‘new ruling caste for Europe’” (*James* 116). The highly assimilated Jews, such as Svevo, were thus envisioned as the “embodiment of [Nietzsche’s] multi-cultural ‘new man,’” or the “secular” “European” into whom Joyce “hoped to remake the Irish” (*James* 119). The Jewish stereotype was then refigured as a positive attribute, and even the predilection for suicide was re-viewed as “Schopenhauerian assertion of the will against the power of circumstance” (*James* 168); Bloom cries at the torturing Bello: “My willpower!” (*U* 15.3216). Undoubtedly, Svevo recognized Bloom as “his own double” who is “polytypic” as “Jewish, Christian, atheistic; occidental and oriental; artist, businessman, Samaritan; father, lover, son” all at the same time, and who thus cannot be stereotyped (*James* 160, 165).

Bloom, representing the modern, non-*Halachic* Jew, however, is stereotyped in various aspects throughout *Ulysses*. In fact, he is “a mosaic of Jewish representation” as the subject of “a spectrum of anti-Jewish myths” (*James* 8). The stereotypes assigned to him are so diverse, even conflicting with each other—as signified by the label “greekjew” (*U* 15.2098)—that “taken together,” they would comprise “the ‘impossible’ figure of the Jew” (Reizbaum 8), which suggests the “unreality of his ‘race’” fixed in Christian myths (Cheyette 224). Yet it is also revealed that Bloom is not the person labelled by others in Dublin, as Ned questions, “Is he a jew or a gentile or

a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? . . . Or who is he?" (*U* 12.1631-32). Bloom was in truth baptized "three times," once Protestant and twice Catholic (*U* 17.542-46). Bloom cannot be called a Jew in *Halachic* sense, then, especially when his mother was not a Jewess and he is uncircumcised (13.979). He says while talking about the citizen: "He called me a jew . . . though in reality I'm not" (*U* 12.1082-85); although he thinks that Stephen thinks "that he [i]s a jew," he knows that Stephen knows that "he kn[ows] that he [i]s not" (*U* 17.530-31).

Still, Bloom the modern Jew is Jewish in his heritage of Hungarian Jew, specifically revealed by his love for "inner organs of beasts and fowls" (*U* 4.1-2, 11.520), which were a staple of Eastern European Yiddish diet, distinct from common Irish diet at that time (*James* 200-01). Moreover, Bloom seems to be bilingual as he sometimes thinks and speaks in Yiddish, as Davidson notes (*James* 206): "Meshuggah. Off his chump" (*U* 8.314); "*kifeloch, harimon rakatejch m'baad l'zamatejch* (thy temple amid thy hair is as a slice of pomegranate)" (*U* 17.729-30). The memory of his "poor papa," who took the soup "for the conversion of poor jews" during the "potato blight" and later committed suicide (*U* 8.1072-73), also haunts him throughout the day. A typesetter who "reads it backwards first" in the newspaper office evokes his late father reading "his haggadah book"—which he still keeps in his drawer (*U* 17.1878)—"backwards with his finger to [him]" (*U* 7.205-07). The Jewish tradition of reading the Haggadah on Passover would continue with his son Rudy if he had not died so young, "aged 11days" (*U* 17.2282), over ten years ago; "a fairy boy of eleven" "dressed in Eton suit" "holding a book in his hand," "read[ing] from right to left" and "kissing the page," the image of "Rudy" as a schoolboy reading the Haggadah appears to Bloom (*U* 15.4957-62). The Jewish custom of kissing the "mezuzah" hanging on the doorpost (Gifford and Seidman 401), the word Bloom misremembers first as

“tephillim,” something his “poor papa’s father had on his door to touch” (*U* 13.1157-58), is followed by Bloom “kiss[ing] [their] halldoor” (*U* 18.1406). Bloom habitually “sleep[s] at the foot of the bed” (*U* 18.1199)⁶ and once “slept on the floor half the night naked the way the jews used when somebody dies belonged to them” (*U* 18.1246-47), though the context was different. Therefore, as Molly says, he is “so foreign from the others” (*U* 13.1210), “not Irish enough” (*U* 18.379). Although not a Jew by religion or the Jewish law, Bloom is in ethnicity. In other words, he is a secular Jew assimilated to modern Christian culture, who is nonetheless liable to stereotyping.

IV. The Anarchist Bloom

It is significant that, as Nietzsche views, many of Jewish stereotypes actually reveal the unique quality of the Jew only as positivity. Particularly, Jewish anti- or sur-nationalism, the assumption of which “anti-Semitism” was propagated on, signifies their multicultural and pacific nature. The Irishmen say, “Why can’t a jew love his country like the next fellow?—Why not? . . . when he’s quite sure which country it is” (*U* 12.1628-30), which suggests that the Jew, wherever they reside, belongs to the Promised Land. In truth, it is not that the Jew does not care about the nation, but that they “resent violence and intolerance” any nationalism incurs; Bloom argues, “It’s a patent absurdity . . . to hate people because they live round the corner and speak another vernacular, in the next house so to speak” (*U* 16.1099-1103). Bloom, belonging to a race “hated and persecuted,” understands that “it’s no use . . .

6) Bloom, like many Jews, seems to avoid sleeping with his feet facing the door, which resembles the position of the dead. See “Sleep Facing the Door” <<https://www.aish.com/atr/Sleeping-Facing-the-Door.html>>.

. force, hatred, history, all that. That's not life for men and women, insult and hatred . . . it's the very opposite of that that is really life," which is "love" (*U* 12.1467, 1481-85). The Jewish view of life as love, though ridiculed by the citizen's remarks "a new apostle to the gentiles" or "universal love" (12.1489), stands for their friendly or Samaritan attitude that go beyond nationalism, as Bloom helps Stephen "in orthodox Samaritan fashion" (*U* 16.3).

More significantly, the Jew's peace-loving nature connects to their pragmatic mind, which is pejoratively viewed as cunning, and inducing money-related stereotypes such as a usurer and a "born gambler" as noted in *The Times* (qtd. in Knepper 303). Bloom is rumored to have won on the Ascot Gold Cup race throughout *Ulysses*: Bantam Lyons, misunderstanding Bloom as giving him a tip on the race, spreads false information that Bloom has bet on the horse *Throwaway*, a "rank outsider," who turns out to be a "dark horse" (*U* 12.1219, 1557). The misinformation that Bloom has won on *Throwaway* at "twenty to one" (*U* 12.1219, 15.4813), which would result in a "hundred shillings to five on" (*U* 12.1556)—subsequently put "hundred to five" (*U* 12.1761, 1908-09; 15.1149)—is most likely based on the assumption that he is a Jew, a "born gambler." On the other hand, another assumption that Bloom is the "only man in Dublin [who] has it" signifies his capability to be a good merchant (*U* 12.1556-57), in contrast to all other Dubliners who lose and are "bad merchant[s]" (16.738). In fact, Bloom recognizes that "all those wretched quarrels" are "very largely a question of the money question which was at the back of everything greed and jealousy" (*U* 16.1111-15), as the nationalist idea behind anti-Semitism was essentially caused by the employment challenge posed by the increasing number of Jewish immigrants. Simultaneously, however, the Jew's inclination to seek material well-being is associated with their peacemaking character, as Bloom tries to help Dignam's widow get paid

the insurance “money” by “those Scottish Widows” (*U* 13.1227), and “take[s] care of” the drunken Stephen’s money not to “pay more” or squander what little he has left (*U* 15.3601-02). Bloom is thus a responsible family man, as Molly acknowledges, who “has sense enough not to squander every penny piece he earns down their gullets and looks after his wife and family” (*U* 18.1277-79), unlike the Irishman, like Simon Dedalus, who spends money “for a shave for the funeral” while his children starve (*U* 10.699). Bloom duly thinks it would be “more sensible to spend the money on some charity” (*U* 6.930) than on the coffin and the “corpse” the Irish “extraordinar[ily]” take their “interest” in (*U* 6.14).

In this regard, Joyce was influenced by the socialist historian Guglielmo Ferrero’s view of Jews, along with Weininger’s and Nietzsche’s discussed earlier. In his book *L’Europa giovane* (1897), Ferrero argued that “Jews had a ‘messianic conscience’” which led to their passion for “either socialism or anarchism” as “their solution for the redemption of humanity” (Reizbaum 31). Joyce’s interest in Ferrero and socialism is revealed in his letter in 1906: “The most arrogant statement made by Israel so far, [Ferrero] says, not excluding the gospel of Jesus, is Marx’s proclamation that socialism is a fulfillment of a natural law. In considering Jews he slips in Jesus” (*SL* 128). This observation of Ferrero evokes Bloom’s “soft answer” to the citizen, a “bite from a sheep” (*U* 16.1085, 1640), which lists well-known “non-Jewish Jews” as Davidson notes (*James* 219), including Marx—though Mercadante seemingly mistakenly (Gifford and Seidman 378)—and Jesus slipped in: “Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx . . . the Saviour was a jew. . . . Your God was a jew. Christ was a jew like me” (*U* 12.1804-09). Ferrero’s theory of Jewish messianism, based on “the ethical spirit, the passion for moral criticism of society and for the vivisection of its lies” (qtd. in Reizbaum 31), is also detectable in the citizen’s mocking Bloom as “the new Messiah for

Ireland” (*U* 12.1642), the parody of Bloom’s escaping his attack as “Bloom Elijah” “ascend[ing] to heaven” (*U* 12.1910-16), or the fantasy of “the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia” (*U* 15.1544-45).

As for Jewish inclination for socialism or anarchism, it is in fact revealed in the Zionist’s claim that Zionism was founded on “cooperative colonization, the nationalization of the soil, [and] the equalization of political and social rights for women”; it was “an economic-social movement” which aimed at “a Palestine that will be a more socially just society than Europe,” a society “which, perceived by the Hebrew prophets, has been scientifically formulated in our day by the Jew, Karl Marx” (qtd. in Davidson, ““Still”” 382). Such egalitarianism is echoed by Bloom, envisaged as “the world’s greatest reformer,” advocating what may be “a parody of Herzl’s vision of a future Palestine” (““Still”” 389): “Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature. . . . Compulsary manual labour for all . . . universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical imposters. Free money, free rent, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state” (*U* 15.1459, 1686-93). Bloom’s emphasis on freedom connects to the fundamentals of anarchism, especially as he is taken for an “anarchist” (*U* 15.1156), which were argued by Pierre-Joseph Prudhon; the “first man willingly to claim the title of anarchist,” defining “property [a]s theft” in his work *What Is Property?* in 1840 (Woodcock 11), Prudhon declared: “Liberty is the mother, not the daughter, of order” (qtd. in Zarakol 2323).

Anarchism, advocating “the replacement of the authoritarian state by some form of nongovernmental cooperation between free individuals,” emerged in the late 1870s within the socialist movement after “the split in the First International” between the followers of Michael Bakunin, a Russian activist and follower of Prudhon, and those of Marx (Woodcock 13). Anarchism or anarchist socialism, represented by Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin, another

Russian influenced by Bakunin and the “most influential anarchist thinker” in late nineteenth-century Britain (Shpayer-Makov), “rejected the authority of *all* states over the ‘individual’,” “emphasiz[ing] liberty” instead (Zarakol 2331). Opposed to Marxists who supported the proletarian dictatorship, anarchists supported that “social revolution must lead to the abolition of all classes” (Woodcock 31). In this respect, Bloom has a strong inclination for anarchist socialism. He “desired to amend many social conditions, the product of inequality and avarice and international animosity” (*U* 17.990-92), and adhered to “the collective and national economic programme” (*U* 17.1646-47), “going a step farther than Michael Davitt” as a “backtothelander” (*U* 16.1592-93). However, he is skeptical of Marxist socialism: “Everyone according to his needs or everyone according to his deeds” (*U* 16.247).

Inevitably, anarchism, though with many variations—including Tolstoyan non-resistance communalism—rejecting the principle of authority in favor of individual choice, embraced violence as a means of social change. No matter how reluctant, anarchists in the 1881 international congress accepted violence, which was inherent in the anarchist claim such as Prudhon’s “I destroy and I build up” or Bakunin’s “The passion for destruction is also a creative passion” (qtd. in Woodcock 14); terrorist tactics as ‘propaganda by deed’ submerged anarchism thereafter.⁷⁾ It is not surprising in this context that the anarchist, depicted as characteristic of “violence, evil intentions, and conspiracy,” was stigmatized as “society’s enemy in every respect” (Shpayer-Makov 501). The negative image of anarchism was so prevalent and secured that some anarchists fearing the association adopted other titles, such as “international revolutionary” or “free socialist,” and some individuals and groups used the title anarchist “as a scare tactic” against their enemies, such

7) See Kil’s review of the development of anarchist activities at the turn of the century in “The Sham and the Fanatic” (486-87).

as immigrant Jews (Shpayer-Makov 511, 514). The Jews, resented as the “terrible economic competitor” or “the ‘fittest’ person to survive in trade competition” (qtd. in Knepper 298), were the “primary racial other” in turn-of-the-century Britain where other ethnic groups were comparatively few (Linett 251). The Royal Commission on Alien Immigration reported in 1903 “the large component of ‘criminals, anarchists, prostitutes and persons of bad character’ in the immigrant community,” “assum[ing] their Jewishness” (Shpayer-Makov 515). Especially, the Greenwich Park bomb explosion in 1894—the only anarchist-related activity incurring a fatality in late Victorian Britain—on which Joseph Conrad’s *The Secret Agent* was based, was presumed to have been plotted by the Jewish anarchist or *agent provocateur* Samuel, fictionalized as Verloc in the novel. The incident, which exploded only the bomb carrier, further contributed to the image “Jacob the Anarchist” as well as “Jacob the Ripper,” the Jew as the “invisible hand of anarchism” (Knepper 304-06, 311). No doubt, Bloom of Hungarian Jewish descent is called an “anarchist,” a “wellknown dynamitar” carrying “the bomb,” “infernal machine with a time fuse” (*U* 15.1156-59, 1197-99). Bloom, the Jewish anarchist, is the “archconspirator of the age,” “anythingarian seeking to overthrow our holy faith” (*U* 15.855, 1712-13). In a word, he is “a public nuisance to the citizens of Dublin” (*U* 15.1159-60).

Significantly however, “anarchist,” like other Jewish stereotypes examined earlier, betrays certain truths or messianic qualities about the Jewish Bloom. Anarchism is conceived with the “deeply moralist element” which idealizes “poverty” that is distinct from “pauperism,” the “sufficiency that will allow men to be free,” which makes anarchism “much more than a mere political doctrine” (Woodcock 28), not to mention a terrorist ideology. Although anarchists who reject conventional moralities are reluctant to highlight it, the aesthetic emphasis on poverty as the “ideal human state,” in which men are

"most free" (Woodcock 28), is consistent with the anarchist philosophy emphasizing liberty. Bloom's support of "everyone" of "all creeds and classes *pro rata* having a comfortable tidysized income," which "would be provocative of friendlier intercourse between man and man" as "most free" individuals (*U* 16.1133-37), hints at his idealistic anarchist quality. In fact, the "more idealistic aspects of anarchism" as "the quest for justice, truth, equality, and rebellion 'against the privileged and pampered class,'" were defended by the "widely circulated Sunday journal *Reynold's Newspaper*" (Shpayer-Makov 502), which appears in "The Boarding House": Mr. Doran "still" buys the radically-inclined Sunday paper "every week" while mostly living "a regular life" (*D* 64), just as Bloom occasionally harbors "all kinds of Utopian plans" (*U* 16.1652).

Yet another implication is evoked by the title "anarchist" attributed to Bloom, in addition to the Jew as the enemy of society and as the idealist, moralist or messiah, which relates back to Jewish pragmatism. The Jewish "anarchist" meant literally the "anarchist" who worked for "wide scale changes in Jewish life" at the turn of the century, that is, a "pragmatic" anarchist making efforts "to improve [their] circumstances"; "schools established by anarchists" offered the impoverished Jews "alternatives" to traditional instruction given by rabbis (Knepper 301). In this respect, the Jewish anarchist had a "contradictory image" as the embodiment of "*the* anarchist threat" discussed earlier and simultaneously as a "hard worker and moderate drinker" (Knepper 303, 304). Bloom is said to be a "decent quiet man" who has "never once" been seen "over the line" at the pub (*U* 8.976-77), which is gossiped again at another pub (*U* 12.435-37); he is thus always "in complete possession of his faculties" (*U* 16.61). A hard-working Jewish anarchist, Bloom lectures that "room for improvement all round there certainly is" "with a little goodwill all round"; "A revolution must come on the due installments plan" without

resorting to “violence and intolerance” (*U* 16.1096-1101). Therefore, Bloom the Jewish anarchist is a “safe man” who has “been known to put his hand down too to help a fellow” (*U* 8.982-84). He is indeed “a man like Ireland wants” (*U* 15.1540).

V. Conclusion

The assimilated Jewish anarchist Bloom as the man Ireland needs—the ideal Irishman—is additionally revealed in two respects: first, the anarchist was the image attributed to the Irish as well as the Jewish, and second, Bloom does not support Zionism after all. The Irish were seen as anarchists because Ireland was assumed to be in the state of “anarchy,” which “called for British supervision” (Shpayer-Makov 493). Particularly, the “Fenians,” the radical Irish nationalists, were identified or confused with “anarchists” as “anarchism and the Irish separatist cause” were “often mentioned in the same breath” in the newspapers such as *Spectator* and *The Times* (Shpayer-Makov 492, 514). Besides, the London “anarchists” were watched by the same division of police organization established to oversee “extreme Irish nationalists” (Knepper 307). The anarchist Bloom, who shares the same negative image imposed on the Irish, is thus identifiable as the Irish.

As to Zionism, the Jewish anarchist Bloom may well sympathize with but eventually rejects the social experiment to build a Palestine founded on the liberal conception of freedoms, as he burns the “Agendath” pamphlet kept all day in his pocket. In fact, Zionism was a deeply controversial issue, with which Joyce was knowledgeable, dividing the Triestine Jews into Zionists, a-Zionists, and anti-Zionists, one half of the last belonging to “orthodox Jews” (“Still” 381). The “majority of urban Jews” were a-Zionists, believing that

“the social justice of liberal humanism would eventually remake Europe” into a place where Jews were not treated differently due to ethnicity (“Why” 703). Bloom appears to be interested in the advertisement of “the model farm” in Palestine found at Dlugacz’s, although it is envisioned as “a barren land, bare waste” (*U* 4.154, 219); “Agendath is a waste land” (*U* 14.1086).⁸ He carries the prospectus on him all day, accidentally “t[aking] out, read[ing] unfolded,” and “thrust[ing] back quick Agendath” (*U* 8.1183-86), until finally destroying it after midnight. Moreover, he sings “the anthem of the Zionist movement” (*U* 17.763-64; Gifford and Seidman 579), though incomplete. It can be said, then, that Bloom supports Zionism as an anarchist idea championing liberty, while considering its feasibility a “*possibility*” rather than a “*probability*” (“Still” 386), as he muses about it: “Nothing doing. Still an idea behind it” (*U* 4.200). That Bloom turns his back on the Israelite state-forming movement, therefore, makes his nation “Ireland,” as he believes, despite the citizen’s sarcastic cry: “Three cheers for Israel!” (*U* 12.1431, 1791).

From this perspective, it is Bloom’s Jewish pragmatic or assimilating faculty that qualifies him for the ideal Irish, keeping his socialist or anarchist inclination under control, preventing him from becoming an international revolutionary or an enthusiastic Zionist as Dlugacz appears to be. “Imbued with the proper spirit,” the “practical” Bloom is able to recognize and adapt to reality as it is (*U* 16.1124-25), as he repeatedly reminds himself, “Well, I am here now. Yes, I am here now” (*U* 4.232-33). Yet the anarchist ideal of freedom is kept up the assimilated Jew’s sleeve, which is indispensable for the prejudiced, oppressed, colonized Irish as well. Bloom’s belief in “life” free from “force, hatred, history,” which is equivalent to the anarchist’s ideal

8) Joyce most likely “encountered the advertisement of Agudath Netaim”—seemingly misspelled or misremembered as “Agendath Netaim”—“the Turkish-based planting company selling land in Palestine” in a journal published by the World Zionist Organization which Herzl founded in 1897 (Reizbaum 21).

human state, is what is most necessary for the Irish, suffering from the death-like colonial paralysis: “In the midst of death we are in life” (*U* 6.759).

(Yeungnam University)

Works Cited

- Bender, Abbey. "The Language of the Outlaw: A Clarification." *JJQ*, vol. 44, no. 4, 2007, pp. 807-12.
- Casement, Roger. "The Language of the Outlaw." 1906. *New England Review*, vol. 25, nos. 1/2, 2004, pp. 155-58.
- Cheyette, Bryan. *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Davidson, Neil. *James Joyce, Ulysses, and the Construction of Jewish Identity: Culture, Biography, and "The Jew" in Modernist Europe*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- . "'Still an Idea behind It': Trieste, Jewishness, and Zionism in *Ulysses*." *JJQ*, vol. 38, nos. 3/4, 2001, pp. 373-94.
- . "Why Bloom Is Not 'Frum,' or Jewishness and Postcolonialism in *Ulysses*." *JJQ*, vol. 39, no. 4, 2002, pp. 679-716.
- Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 1974. UP of Michigan, 1995.
- Joyce, James. *Dubliners*. Penguin, 1956.
- . *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, edited by Richard Ellmann. Farber and Farber, 1975.
- . *Ulysses*. Random. 1986.
- Kiberd, Declan. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*. Harvard UP, 1995.
- Kil, Hye Ryoung. "A Broader Nationalism in 'Cyclops': Joyce's Bloom and Casement." *James Joyce Journal*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2013, pp. 5-28.
- . "The Sham and the Fanatic: Conrad's Anarchists in 'Ironic,' 'Desperate,' and *Simple Tales*." *Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2020, pp. 483-502.

- Knepper, Paul. "The Other Invisible Hand: Jews and Anarchists in London before the First World War." *Jewish History*, vol. 22, 2008, pp. 292-315.
- Levitt, Morton P. "'The Greatest Jew of All': James Joyce, Leopold Bloom and the Modernist Archetype." *Papers on Joyce*, vols. 10/11, 2005, pp. 143-62.
- Linett, Maren. "Introduction: Modernism's Jew/Jewish Modernisms." *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 51, no. 2, 2005, pp. 249-57.
- Maley, Willy. "'Kilt by Kelt Shell Kithagain with Kinagain': Joyce and Scotland." *Semicolonial Joyce*, edited by Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes, Cambridge UP, 2000, pp. 201-18.
- Nadel, Ira Bruce. "Joyce and the Jews." *Modern Judaism*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1986, pp. 301-10.
- Ó Gráda, Cormac. "Lost in Little Jerusalem: Leopold Bloom and Irish Jewry." *Journal of Modern Literature*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2004, pp. 17-26.
- Reizbaum, Marilyn. *James Joyce's Judaic Other*. Stanford UP, 1999.
- Shpayer-Makov, Haia. "Anarchism in British Public Opinion 1880-1914." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1988, pp. 487-516.
- Zarakol, Ayse. "What Makes Terrorism Modern? Terrorism, Legitimacy, and the International System." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 37, no. 5, 2011, pp. 2311-36.
- Woodcock, George. *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements*. Meridian, 1962.

AbstractThe “Non-Jewish” Jewish “Anarchist” Bloom in *Ulysses*:
The Ideal Irishman

Hye Ryoung Kil

This essay examines the protagonist Bloom’s non-*Halachic* Jewishness, specifically the anarchist inclination, as the ideal Irish identity. Bloom represents the modern European Jew, assimilated to Christian culture, thus technically “non-Jewish Jew.” The assimilated Jew Bloom is endowed with survival qualities, such as multicultural, pacific, and pragmatic thinking, which are negatively defined as a-national, feminine, and profit-loving nature, respectively. Capable of surviving the nationalist and racist Europe, Bloom is suggested as the ideal Irish, similarly suffering cultural and racial prejudices under British rule.

One of the stereotypes assigned to the Jew was a criminal, particularly an anarchist, image which represented violence and conspiracy. While the anarchist acquired an evil reputation as the enemy of society, given the terrorist activity carried out throughout Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, the fundamental principle of anarchism stands for liberty, rejecting all authorities. The Jew, inclined to have a “messianic” conscience, was a socialist or an anarchist in disposition according to Joyce’s reading of the socialist historian Ferrero. Bloom’s belief in “life” as “love,” free from violence and intolerance, reveals him as the assimilated Jewish anarchist who dreams of a free community founded on voluntary activities of free individuals. Furthermore, with his pragmatism, which eventually leads him to reject the Zionist movement, Bloom’s peaceful anarchist tendency renders him desirable

for colonial Ireland which needs a practical freedom-loving mind.

■ **Key words** : *Ulysses*, non-Jewish Jew, anarchist, anti-Semitism, Irish Jew
(『율리시스』, 비유대교적 유대인, 무정부주의자, 반유대주의, 아일랜드 유대인)

논문접수: 2021년 11월 9일

논문심사: 2021년 11월 9일

게재확정: 2021년 12월 2일