A philosopher: this is a person who constantly experiences, sees, hears, suspects, hopes, and dreams extraordinary things; who is struck by his own thoughts as if from outside, from above and below, as if by his type of events and lightning bolts; who is perhaps a storm himself, pregnant with new lightning; a fatal person in whose vicinity things are always rumbling, growling, gaping, and acting in uncanny ways. A philosopher: oh, a being who is frequently running away from himself, frequently afraid of himself,—but too curious not to always come back to himself...

- Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Section 292
Introduction: Approaching a New Literature

In conversation with the nationalist, dogmatizing Mr. Deasy, who asserts that human history is driven towards "the manifestation of God", Stephen Dedalus maintains, "History...is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (Joyce 28). Like his character, James Joyce seeks a similar detachment from Mr. Deasy's strain of thought and from the gravity garnered by "History", yet unlike the brooding Stephen, who submits to Mr. Deasy's authority, Joyce acts upon that gravity and achieves his escape from the constraints of History in the composition of *Ulysses*, a text that defies the realist dogma of Mr. Deasy's breed of intellectual.

In its immensely intertextual and self-engulfing quality, the most immediate difficulty in reading *Ulysses* is finding a single unifying thread by which to guide oneself throughout the text. That is to say, *Ulysses* itself is a network of threads, themes, and perspectives that all materialize within the text, simultaneously justifying and undermining the validity of each other in their denial of an objective reality within the events of the novel and in the manner through which the text is mediated to the reader. In an essay entitled "Joyce the Modernist", Christopher Butler enforces the notion that Joyce creates a literary entity that upholds a diversity of perspectives and styles, epitomizing the modernist move towards a more experimental practice of literature that opposes the dogmatic realism of the Enlightenment: "By the time he is writing *Ulysses* [Joyce] has set himself the 'task' of writing a book from eighteen different points of view and in as many styles" (CCJJ, Butler, 69). In composing such an exemplary perspectival literary experience, and
say experience so as not to bind *Ulysses* to a specific literary medium, Joyce seeks to expose the *will to order* that drives the analytic minds of traditional western intellectualism to impose meaning and assert an objective truth.

In reading *Ulysses*, what occurs is an experience of self-consciousness as the sense of one’s inner impulse to rationalize, order, and maintain an objective reality within the text is challenged and exposed. This is a crucial aspect of *Ulysses*’ significance as a revolutionary text within the canon of Western literature, as conventional means of ordering the text, specifically consistent and coherent narrative styles, are purposefully discarded so as to challenge how a reader interacts with a text. Joyce battles this will to order through a *will to create* values rather than to re-affirm old values within a given framework. The will to create, specifically as it is acted out in *Ulysses* in its constant manipulation of language, mimetic style, and perspective, is what drives Joyce to revaluate literary conventions.

A better understanding of this crucial notion of the will to create in *Ulysses* can be achieved in illuminating the connection between Joyce’s approach to literature and German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche’s approach to philosophy, which shares this desire to awaken from the nightmare of History. Returning to “Joyce the modernist”, Butler connects Joyce’s revolutionary literature to a series of late 19th century thinkers, but most significantly to the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche: “This revolt focused on a ‘transvaluation of all values’; and those who were most self-conscious about it tended to be followers of Nietzsche” (Attridge, 67). This statement is not to say that Nietzsche is the father of Modernism or that Joyce has inherited Nietzsche’s ideology, but rather that Joyce and Nietzsche share a
similar drive that opposes the type of thought of the Mr. Deasys in the world. In “transvaluating all values”, a concept that becomes significant with Nietzsche’s philosophy as Butler suggests, Joyce and Nietzsche seek to overturn the existing moral, or more specifically in Joyce’s case, literary, codes of western thought, which center upon Christian dogma and deny natural instincts.

The figurehead for Nietzsche, and an important type of character to consider in *Ulysses*, of this campaign against the ascetic intellectualism and nihilistic dogmatism of traditional western thought is the ‘free-spirited’ new philosopher:

Perhaps the philosopher has had to be a critic and a skeptic and a dogmatist and historian and, moreover, a poet and collector and traveler and guesser of riddles and moralist and seer and ‘free spirit’ and practically everything, in order to run through the range of human values and value feelings and *be able to gaze* with many eyes and consciences from the heights into every distance, from the depths up to every height, from the corner into every expanse. But all these are only preconditions for his task: the task itself has another will,—it calls for him to *create values.*” (Nietzsche, BGE, 105)

In this passage Nietzsche suggests that philosophers have inherently engaged reality with the will to order of a dogmatist and historian, the same will to order that Joyce challenges and exploits through *Ulysses*. Yet, he continues by describing the philosopher’s role as, more importantly, a poet and “free spirit” who accepts a perspectival reality, denying the dogmatic will to order in an existence directed towards “the manifestation of God”. Most significantly for Nietzsche, a central influence of Joyce as Butler suggests, the task of philosophy has a will to create values, a drive that will be shown to be elemental to *Ulysses* in its transvaluation of the will to order that plagues traditional literary consciousness.

As Nietzsche suggests in *Beyond Good and Evil*, the concept of perspectivism is a necessary precondition for the task of creating values, and is foundational to
Joyce's project in *Ulysses*. In an essay entitled "Modernist Theaters of the Mind I" from *Libidinal Currents*, Joseph Allen Boone cites a quote from Joyce in a 1922 interview about *Ulysses* in which he says of the novel, "I have recorded, simultaneously, what a man says, sees, thinks, and what such seeing, thinking, saying does, to what you Freudians call the subconscious" (Boone 146). Joyce's statement contends that *Ulysses* displays the fundamentally subjective perspective of the inner workings of the human mind. That Joyce employs multiple perspectives throughout the novel, then, via Stephen, Bloom, Molly, and the various instances when their voices succumb to the characters around them, suggests that Joyce himself, in composing such a work of art, assumes the Nietzschean role of the new philosopher, who is able to experience a range of human values and "gaze with many eyes and consciences" in an effort to create new literary values through a perspectival reality.

While Joyce and Nietzsche share this will to create and transvaluate existing dogmatic values, Nietzsche cannot achieve through his philosophy what Joyce does through literature. That is to say, Nietzsche preaches where Joyce practices. Nietzsche cannot be the philosopher of the future he describes in *Beyond Good and Evil*, a figure that Joyce becomes in producing *Ulysses*, a literary experience beyond any that is capable of a philosophical text. While the two authors share the drive to provoke a reader's self-consciousness, Nietzsche is omnipresent in his philosophy, whereas *Ulysses* is, in some sense, an entity on its own, which allows Joyce, at times, to detach himself from the text and thus remove the objective imposition of authorial presence. Even on a thematic level, the main characters themselves,
Stephen and Bloom, are presented in a perspectival display of the Nietzschean ideals of the Apolline and Dionysiac creative drives that govern all artistic thought, providing a mosaic of the ideals of the new philosopher in their convergence. In understanding these Nietzschean ideals both thematically and stylistically within *Ulysses*, it is evident that James Joyce achieves the type of perspectival literary experience that Nietzsche outlines, yet only strives for in his philosophy.

**Joyce and Nietzsche: The Role of the Author**

In approaching *Ulysses* with Nietzsche in mind, a significant discovery, in terms of identifying within the text the will to create values that drives it, is the role Joyce plays in relation to his text. The parallel between Joyce's ontological project as confronted by Boone, the notion of recording all facets of human experience and consciousness, and Nietzsche's conception of a new philosophy, which endorses a perspectival view of the world, suggests that the role Joyce plays as the author of *Ulysses* embodies the ideals of the new philosopher himself. Specifically, within the framework Nietzsche provides, the artistic drive and metaphorical gaze that exemplifies the philosopher of the future pertains to Joyce's literary will to create, or as Nietzsche would put it, a "will to power", within *Ulysses*.

To understand this will to power of the author upon the artwork in *Ulysses*, it is important to first understand the significance of this relationship for Nietzsche and his texts, as both authors position themselves with their texts in similar ways, but also in order to qualify the extent to which *Ulysses* embodies Nietzschean ideals that his texts only point to. Nietzsche's works, like Joyce's, build upon and interact
with each other, and thus occupy a sort of continuum through which the reader understands the concepts at play. A common theme throughout Beyond Good and Evil, The Gay Science, and The Birth of Tragedy is the importance of the artistic drive that exemplifies the “new philosopher”. In Section 211 of Beyond Good and Evil, Nietzsche asserts that the new philosophers will engage reality as metaphor and live as artists, driven by a will to power: “True philosophers reach for the future with a creative hand and everything that is and was becomes a means, a tool, a hammer for them. Their ‘knowing’ is creating, their creating is a legislating, their will to truth is—will to power” (Nietzsche, BGE, 106). The new philosopher, in this sense, is a philosopher-artist hybrid who engages reality metaphorically. That is to say, the new philosopher doesn’t seek an objective truth or reality, but lives aesthetically, engaging, as Joyce might say, what one “says, sees, thinks, and what such seeing, thinking, saying does, to what you Freudians call the subconscious”. The new philosopher ‘creates’ out of this aesthetic experience, imprinting himself upon a world of masks and signs. It is no surprise, then, that Joyce arises as this figure, the Zarathustra of literature, unshackling his text from linguistic rationality in a constant legislation of reality within the minds of his characters. Just one example of this occurs, for instance, in Chapter 12, “The Cyclops”, in which Joyce injects within the conversation between Bloom and the other characters aesthetic stimuli translated into language: “Ga Ga Gara. Klook Klook Klook. Black Liz is our hen. She lays eggs for us. When she lays her egg she is so glad. Gara. Klook Klook Klook. Then comes good uncle Leo. He puts his hand under black Liz and takes her fresh egg. Ga ga ga ga gara. Klook Klook Klook” (Joyce, 259). This onomatopoetic spurt within the
text is seemingly nonsensical, yet embodies the creative hand that Joyce takes to relaying the perspectival reality he creates in *Ulysses*. Joyce inserts this passage in order to jostle the narrative from the set path of one voice, rather granting the mimetic voice here the imaginative capacity to occupy the perspective of the hen. Joyce creates perspective through a legislation of language and narrative form, which dissolves in the perspectival reality he creates within the text in a will to create, a will to power.

This will to power of the author upon his work is what Alexander Nehamas, in *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*, marks as Nietzsche's crowning achievement as the most "writerly" philosopher. The most important notion to gain from Nehamas is that Nietzsche's effectiveness as a philosopher is in relation to the literariness of his approach to philosophy, which is, in turn, why Joyce achieves what Nietzsche cannot. In elucidating the will to power that persists Nietzsche's imprinting of himself upon his works in an attempt to display his own call for a "new philosopher", Nehamas distinguishes the works of Nietzsche as distinctly (and purposefully) resistant to the orderly quality of philosophical treatises, utilizing an aphoristic style that invokes the non-systematic, non-argumentative nature of Pre-Socratic philosophy.

In effect, Nehamas sees Nietzsche as creating a character of himself within his work in order to push his philosophical agenda poetically: "In [Nietzsche's] eyes, at least, it is only such a character who can influence history and thought and who, like the Socrates who emerges out of Plato's dialogues, can manifest the will to power in fashioning values and modes of life" (Nehamas, 199). In other words, the
characteristic voice of Nietzsche's canon of works is in relation to the authorial Nietzsche in the way that Plato manipulates the figure of Socrates in his dialogues. This self-fashioning is, in effect, the legislating that Nietzsche calls for, a creation of a character that occupies a perspective not of Nietzsche's own. This move of Nietzsche's to philosophize through a caricatured avatar allows himself some distance, yet the consistency of this voice gives his texts a narrative quality that keeps Nietzsche anchored to the text whereas Ulysses' perspectival experience frees Joyce.

Yet this self-fashioning Nehamas sees as Nietzsche's display of will to power is related to Joyce's will to power in that it is the drive that governs all beings, one that maintains the ideal of perspectivism, or anti-dogmatism:

The content of his works, however, remains a set of philosophical views: the literary character who is their product is still a philosopher who has made of these views a way of life and who urges others to make a way of life out of views of their own—views which, consistently with his perspectivism, he cannot and will not supply for them. (Nehamas, 234)

In this framework, Nietzsche's literary significance and poetic representation is the achievement of his philosophical revaluation of the western tradition. In creating his own character, Nietzsche escapes from asserting a dogmatic philosophical view, yet stages a compelling argument directed at provoking the reader's sensibilities. The same could be argued for Ulysses, which imposes no one objective narrative, but a multiplicity that provokes the reader to question their literary consciousness.

In Ulysses, James Joyce occupies a similar position in relation to his text as Nietzsche does to his and, concordantly, exhibits the same will to power in his self-fashioning within a novel that provokes readers to revaluate their literary
sensibilities. In the opening essay from the *Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* entitled “Reading Joyce”, Derek Attridge’s approach to engaging a Joycean text is to emphasize the interconnectivity of Joyce’s texts, the fluidity of genre within them, and the role Joyce plays in relation to them. In this sense, Attridge’s approach to Joyce suggests that Joyce’s canon of texts invokes the Nietzschean consistency of voice that arises in creating a space between the author and the voice of a text:

The various Stephens of *Stephen Hero*, *A Portrait*, and *Ulysses*, together with the Shem of *Finnegan’s Wake*, are related in interesting (and ultimately unspecifiable) ways not only to one another, but also to the consciousness we perceive—with increasing difficulty—as the ‘author’ in each of these books, as well as the individual named ‘James Joyce’ whom we meet in the biographical accounts. (CCJJ, Attridge, 24)

In this passage Attridge’s notion of a consistent voice in Joyce intersects with Nehamas’s notion of Nietzsche’s creation of a character to speak in the stead of “Mr. Nietzsche”, who is distinguished from the speaking voice early in *The Gay Science*, for example (Nietzsche, GS, Section 2, pg. 4). The significant difference, however, is that Joyce’s consistency of voice is “related” yet “ultimately unspecifiable”, as a result of the multiplicity of lenses Joyce creates. In contrast, Nietzsche can be identified as the Plato to his own Socrates, which allows him a means of self-fashioning through which he can create new literary values by not asserting his personal views, yet inherently places him within a specific relation to his texts that Joyce avoids, especially the fluidity of voice and perspective witnessed in *Ulysses* from chapter to chapter.

Specifically, Joyce’s manipulation of narrative voice by slipping in and out of interior monologue, dialogue, and third-person narration allows him to go beyond the Plato-Socrates relationship that gives Nietzsche some traction, yet cannot gain
him pure literary freedom. A clear instance of this slipperiness of voice occurs in Chapter 3, Proteus, in which the action of the chapter is the literary representation of Stephen’s (sub)conscious thoughts as he walks along a beach. Stephen’s experience in this chapter is remarkably internal, as his modus operandi is to “Shut your eyes and see” (Joyce, 31), which allows Joyce the freedom to expose what it might mean for sensuous experience to take hold in subjective thought. What occurs throughout the chapter is almost entirely within the mind of Stephen, who, if we recall Attridge’s argument, represents one of the many perspectival voices created by Joyce. The fluidity of voice that Joyce achieves becomes evident when he intertwines Stephen’s interior monologue with external narration, effectively blurring the lines distinguishing Joyce and his novel:

He lay back at full stretch over the sharp rocks, cramming the scribbled note and pencil into a pocket, his hat tilted down on his eyes. That is Kevin Egan’s movement I made, nodding for his nap, Sabbath sleep. Et vidit Deus. Et errant valde bona. Hlo! Bonjour. Welcome as the flowers in May. Under its leaf he watched through peacocktwiterring lashes the southing sun. I am caught in this burning scene. Pan’s hour, the faunal noon. Among gumheavy serpentplants, milkoozing fruits, where on the tawny waters leaves lie wide. Pain is far.

And no more turn aside and brood.

His gaze brooded on his broadtoed boots, a buck’s castoffs, neibeneinander. He counted the creases of nicked leather wherein another’s foot had nested warm. The foot that beat the ground in tripudium, foot I dissolve. But you were delighted when Esther Osvalt’s shoe went on you; girl I knew in Paris. Tiens, quel petit pied! Staunch friend, a brother soul: Wilde’s love that dare not speak its name. His arm: Cranly’s arm. He now will leave me. And the blame? As I am. As I am. All or not at all. (Joyce, 41)

This passage commences with an external narrator narrating Stephen’s physical presence, which Joyce imperceptibly transitions back and forth with Stephen’s interior monologue. It is significant to note that the external narrator begins speaking in simple language, but then gets more embellished as it becomes more entrenched in Stephen’s interior thoughts.
This passage exemplifies the looseness with which Joyce interacts with his texts, as different voices play off each other and dissolve together, allowing a perspectival experience that Nietzsche lacks in his philosophical musings, however poetic they may be. This goes on to the extent that the external narrator seems to exhibit his own subconscious thoughts, i.e. the utterance of the term "neibeneinander", which appropriately means "things happening simultaneously", maintaining the philosophical significance of this chapter in which Stephen muses on the "Ineluctable modality of the visible" (Joyce, 31). This term, coming at the end of a sentence narrating Stephen's actions, gives the narrator's voice subjectivity, which is immediately elusive as Joyce transitions back into Stephen's interior monologue. At one point Stephen's self-reference, "you were delighted when Esther Osvalt's shoe went on you: girl I knew in Paris", sets up the illusion that Stephen is, in a sense, in dialogue with the external narrator. Thus, in this passage we see two voices, both representing Joyce in some way, coinciding in one instance, hence "neibeneinander". The conflation of Stephen as a voice of Joyce and the external narrator's role as the abstract "James Joyce" acts to dissolve the actual position of Joyce in relation to the text, thus granting Ulysses the ultimate means perspectival representation that Nietzsche lacks in his often polemical and argumentative works.

More distinct instances of Joyce's manipulation of voice within the novel in terms of going beyond the literary style of Nietzsche's Plato-Socrates relationship come in the Circe and Penelope chapters. To expand on this we return to Boone, who places significance on the modernist movement's turn "within", i.e. the persistence of interior psychological forces and the rejection of objectivity. Boone's
analysis of *Ulysses* centers on these two markedly different chapters, "Circe" and "Penelope", as Circe takes the form of a dramatic script in which the ordering capacity of narrative voice is vacated, which Boone argues promotes the notion that "the mind remains a theater" (Boone, 161). Given Boone's theatrical focus, Nietzsche's trademark ideals of the Apolline and Dionysiac creative drives, which mark the achievement of Greek Tragedy he describes in *The Birth of Tragedy* and outlines within the figure of the new philosopher, take center stage for Joyce in Circe. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche's description of the experience of the Dionysiac is echoed by the dream-quality of Circe:

> If we add to this horror the blissful ecstasy which arises from the innermost ground of man, indeed of nature itself, whenever this breakdown of the principium individuationis occurs, we catch a glimpse of the essence of the Dionysiac, which is best conveyed by the analogy of intoxication. These Dionysiac stirrings, which as they grow in intensity, cause subjectivity to vanish to the point of complete self-forgetting, awaken either under the influence of narcotic drink, of which all human beings and peoples who are close to the origin of things speak in their hymns, or at the approach of spring when the whole of nature is pervaded by lust for life. (Nietzsche, BT, 17)

The principium individuationis, the Apolline notion of upholding a sense of the individual as distinct from the world, is broken down in Circe's dramatic script, in which Bloom and Stephen are simply characters, rather than privileged voices. Like Nietzsche's idea of Dionysiac experience, which causes subjectivity to vanish in a self-forgetting, Circe displays Stephen talking in lyrics and Latin phrases without his contemplative commentary, while Bloom is consumed by dreams of his family (Joyce, 359, 497), unable to restrain his inner desires. In this framework, one might think that by imposing this medium of representation, Joyce takes on the role of the playwright, yet Joyce's choice of literary style here reflects the events of the text, as
Bloom and Stephen, the favored perspectives of the novel, are under the influence of absinthe and, on a stylistic level, shed their Apolline interior monologues in a Dionysiac union with the text.

This reading of Circe is contrasted in methodology to the Penelope chapter in which Molly’s stream-of-consciousness performance serves as a space through which a psychosexual consciousness of the character arises. In the case of Penelope, Boone suggests that “what is interior and what is exterior is hopelessly blurred as Joyce’s attempt to represent Molly’s ‘interiority’ in ‘external’ form becomes a manifestation of his own interior anxieties” (Boone, 172). In this sense, the text as a means of exploring the inner consciousness of a character becomes a space through which Joyce’s subjectivity is exposed, and in doing so Joyce creates an interaction between himself and Molly: “O Jamesy let me up out of this pooh sweets of sin” (Joyce 633), in which Molly is given a voice that transcends the immediacy of the text in its call upon the existing author.

The implications of this uncontainable presence of Molly in Penelope, along with the notion that it still “takes a Joyce to write a ‘Molly’ into being” (Boone 171), invigorates the perspectival project of Joyce, who positions himself in relation to his text in a way that Nietzsche strives for in the new philosopher. That is to say, Joyce escapes the imposition of a single, dogmatic voice in his text through an achievement of a perspectival experience, jostling the reader’s tyrannical will to order. While Joyce puts into practice the idea of the philosopher-artist of which Nietzsche preaches, he still operates under the governance of the will to power that gives Nietzsche’s project its thrust in the pursuit of transvaluation.
Ulysses: A Perspectival Experience

As has been touched upon, an elemental notion that gives traction to Nietzsche's philosophic revaluation of Enlightenment ideals is the assertion of a perspectival truth over an objective truth. In creating values, a perspective must inevitably be taken to challenge existing values, but through authorial distance from the text achieved in the creation of a voice through which to speak yet not assert, Joyce and Nietzsche practice a will to power without directly owning the views of their character. What is achieved in Ulysses, as in Nietzsche's texts, is the effect of jostling the reader's literary consciousness through a perspectival view of the world so as to push against Socratic arguments that depend on scientific threads to order a text. Joyce's project in writing Ulysses, promotes the significance of acknowledging a perspectival reality stylistically, through the constant fluidity of genre from chapter to chapter, and thematically, within the experiences of the two main characters.

To return to Butler's essay, "Joyce the modernist", an essential aspect of Ulysses is Joyce's resistance to cyclopean monuments of the past, i.e. the dogmatic views of religion and nationalism. In "writing a book from eighteen different points of view and in as many styles" (CCJ, Butler, 69), Joyce's Ulysses invokes the spirit of stylistic diversity in Nietzsche's philosophical works, which abandoned traditional syllogistic reasoning for a non-argumentative aphoristic style, as seen in The Gay Science, in which Nietzsche employs poetry and a variety of prose styles. The imposition upon a single text of a multitude of genres and styles from chapter to chapter actively abolishes any sense of order a reader may try to appropriate within
the text. Joyce is essentially taking eighteen different points of view of the same reality, through the same characters. It is, in fact, only the consistency of the main character’s voices and their idiosyncratic impulses that a reader may guide themselves through the novel. This adoption of “a ‘series of rhetorical masks’” (CCJJ, Butler, 69) emphasizes the connection between Nietzsche’s approach to philosophy and Joyce’s literature, which brings to the surface of the text Joyce’s motives of the reinvigoration of artistic consciousness. This methodologically innovative means of representation, employing a different style for every chapter, allows for a more pointedly “perspectival” view of a projected reality that occurs in Ulysses.

In her essay “Ulysses”, from The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce, Jennifer Levine expands on the fluidity of literary genre that exemplifies Ulysses, posing the issue of approaching it as a poem, novel, or text. This range of classifications that all apply to Ulysses suggests Joyce’s achievement in creating a work of art that challenges the conventions of genre. Concordantly, Levine states in defense of the poetic stance, that the work is a “vast symbolic project whose logic is metaphorical and allusive rather than narrative” (CCJJ, Levine, 129), which further aligns Ulysses with the Nietzschean principle of philosophical representation as artistic rather than scientific, thus inviting the reader to interpret Ulysses rather than take it as an objective assertion.

What becomes illuminated in maintaining the notion of Joyce’s metaphorical and allusive logic in opposition to a narrative logic, in relation to Nietzsche’s philosophical project, is the reader’s dependency on the perspectives of Stephen and Bloom to guide them through the work. This dependency surfaces when a privileged
perspective is lost and Bloom becomes an object under scrutiny of a subject, as in
the Nausicaa chapter when Gerty McDowell's view of an interaction with Bloom is
juxtaposed to the very different perspective of how Bloom internalizes the same
experience:

(Gerty McDowell)

He was in deep mourning, she could see that, and the story of a haunting
sorrow was written on his face. She would have given worlds to know what it
was. He was looking up so intently, so still... (Joyce, 293)

(Leopold Bloom)

Tight boots? No. She's lame! O!
Mr. Bloom watched her as she limped away. Poor girl! That's why she's left
on the shelf and the others did a sprint. Thought something was wrong by the
cut of her jib. Jilted beauty. A defect is ten times worse in a woman. But
makes them polite. Glad I didn't know it when she was on show. Hot little
devil all the same. I wouldn't mind. (Joyce 301)

In this interaction that occurs on the beach in the Nausicaa chapter, Gerty's
extensive interior monologue serves to expose the privileged nature of Bloom's
subjectivity, which abruptly returns mid-thought. Having followed Bloom for many
chapters up to this point, the reader could guess from Bloom's sexual objectification
of women that his perspective is probably in stark contrast to hers. When his voice
returns, the transition highlights the complete disparity between two perspectives
of the same situation. While Gerty's exhibitionism has sexual meaning, her first
impression of Bloom is to gain his perspective, fancying him a suitable mate,
regardless of whether he was "a protestant or methodist". Contrastedly, Bloom's
perspective is immediately a sensual, sexual one in which his body governs the
course of his thoughts and he is unconcerned about any spiritual significance.
What arises from this crucial shifting of perspective in *Ulysses* is the implication on Joyce's part that there is no single truth in a given reality, but rather that truth is perspectival and not objective. This Nietzschean ideal of resisting objective truths persists throughout *Ulysses*, which purposefully resists any kind of ordering mechanism through which to guide one's reading: "Because there is no single language that provides and authorizes a meaning (neither one of the voices of the past nor the voice of Joyce standing above his creation), meaning can only be relational, produced in the spaces between languages—in their play" (Levine, CCJJ, 145). This assertion of *Ulysses*’s display of a perspectival reality puts into practice the conceptual framework of Nietzsche’s vision of reality: "Hidden beneath the reality in which we live and have our being there also lies a second, quite different reality; in other words, this reality too is a semblance" (Nietzsche, BT, 15). In accordance with Nietzsche’s call for the philosopher to engage reality as metaphorical, Joyce’s metaphorical logic within the reality of *Ulysses*, along with its plurality of languages and voices, and the contrasting experiences thereof, reinforces the idea that meaning can only be relational. Joyce’s performance in *Ulysses* of the ideals of Nietzsche’s philosopher-artist emphasizes this engagement of a metaphorical reality, and produces a text that grants meaning in relation between the perspectives given by its characters.

In addition to the semblance of the text as an entity in itself and Joyce’s activation of the philosopher-artist figure, the perspectival reality occurs within the text as Joyce’s main characters Dedalus and Bloom are both presented to the reader as shades of the philosopher-artist espoused by Nietzsche. Dedalus and Bloom
represent the ideals of the philosopher of the future in the way Joyce presents their subjective realities, as both characters "gaze with many eyes and consciences from the heights into every distance". When we are first introduced to Bloom, Joyce inserts this theme of perspectival seeing within his character: "They call them stupid. They understand what we say better than we understand them. She understands all she wants to. Vindictive too. Cruel. Her nature. Curious mice never squeal. Seem to like it. Wonder what I look like to her. Height of a tower? No, she can jump me" (Joyce, 45). Bloom is a constantly curious character, reflecting on his sensuous experience in his head, of which this is just one instance. In engaging the subjective reality of his cat, Bloom retains the stylistic theme in Ulysses of questioning the masks of reality rather than accepting metaphors for truths. Rather than assume the dogmatic perspective of a typical human, the philosopher-artist Bloom ponders on the reality that the cat experiences. Furthermore, Joyce specifically makes the subject to which Bloom is addressing ambiguous as a means through which to challenge the reader to question the direction of literary voice. This is evident, as the reader eventually finds out, in Molly's presence in juxtaposition to the cat in Chapter 4. Both the cat and Molly, who is lounging in bed like a cat, have similar reactions to Bloom in his offer of breakfast, as the cat goes "Mrkgnao!" and Molly goes "Mn" (Joyce, 45-46). Bloom engages both subjects and both subjects respond to him, yet their conflation leads the reader to question the slipperiness of perspective in the subjects Bloom encounters. Moreover, Bloom's status as a means through which Joyce displays the ideal of "gazing with many eyes", 
implies that Joyce's stylistic perspectivism ranges to the mimetic level of his characters, who function as conceptual representations.

Even the ascetic Stephen, who often occupies his own mind, less inviting of other subjects than Bloom, has his instances of perspectival seeing. This is most evident in his interaction with his sister, Dilly, in Chapter Ten, Wandering Rocks: "My eyes they say she has. Do others see me so? Quick, far and daring. Shadow of my mind" (Joyce, 200). In a rare moment of connection between the distant Stephen and another character in the text, Joyce's display of a perspectival reality materializes within the mind of Stephen, who sees himself in his sister, a comparison that jostles his very subjectivity. This can only occur, however, in the emphasis placed on the voice that Joyce has granted Stephen. It is precisely the existence of these characters of Joyce, that is the tools of Joyce, that the voices of Stephen and Bloom can manipulate a reader's sense of perspective within the text. It is Joyce's display of these perspectives and not his own omniscient assertion of them upon the reader that allows for an understanding of the significance of such a perspectivism that is only called upon and not practiced in Nietzsche’s philosophical texts.

Joyce’s Tragic Heroes

While aspects of Ulysses' invite the comparison stylistically and conceptually between the two authors, Joyce's fruition of Nietzsche's philosophy in literary form is activated within his characters. That is to say, the creative drives that Nietzsche identifies as the governing impulses of artistic expression and aesthetic experience are played out in Joyce's characters Stephen and Bloom. Though Joyce himself may
occupy the position of the new philosopher and practice what Nietzsche preaches, on a mimetic level, Stephen and Bloom serve as representations of Nietzschean ideals within a given reality and embody the creative drives that Nietzsche discusses in *The Birth of Tragedy*. The fruition of these drives within *Ulysses* serves to reinforce the significance of the connection between Joyce and Nietzsche, yet also marks the achievement of Joyce’s literature to represent concepts through a metaphorical logic.

Joyce’s two main characters in *Ulysses*, Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom, serve as compasses that guide the reader of *Ulysses* through the text. In recording the aesthetic imprint of the world upon the subject and the synthesis of that experience subconsciously within that subject, Joyce displays the symbiotic relationship Nietzsche establishes between the Apolline and Dionysiac creative drives in *The Birth of Tragedy*:

The continuous evolution of art is bound up with the duality of the *Apolline* and the *Dionysiac* in much the same way as reproduction depends on there being two sexes which co-exist in a state of perpetual conflict interrupted only occasionally by periods of reconciliation (Nietzsche, BT, 14).

For Nietzsche, there exist two separate art worlds, that of dream and of intoxication. The creative drive of the Apolline consists of the will to order, giving form and structure to our impulses as if making sense of a dream. This Apolline drive more or less represents the traditional objective values that Joyce pushes against in *Ulysses*. This is in contrast to the ecstatic state of the intoxicated Dionysiac, who experiences the unbridled power of the primordial unity of all things, breaking down subjective consciousness.
In tracking *Ulysses* within this framework, Joyce’s exhibition of the subjective experiences of Stephen and Bloom align them, more or less, with the ascetic, Apolline drive and the aesthetic, Dionysiac drive, respectively. A salient juxtaposition of these two character types arises in the transition from Proteus to Part II, Chapter 4, Calypso, in which Bloom enters onto the Joycean stage. In Proteus, a chapter in which Stephen exhibits his introverted nature and intellectual prowess through an influx of allusions and metaphors, this contemplative character takes an artistic view of the world, yet remains distant within his intellectual cocoon: “Open your eyes now. I will. One moment. Has all vanished since? If I open and am for ever in the black adiaphane. *Basta!* I will see if I can see” (Joyce 31). Here Stephen sets the tone for the chapter in which no real action occurs outside of his inner musings, invoking the Apolline creative drive, which “governs the lovely semblance produced by the inner world of fantasy” (Nietzsche, BT, 16), in order to maintain one’s subjectivity and engage the world metaphorically. Stephen engages the physical world on his own accord, subordinating it to the dogmatic presence of his own mind, his subjective fantasy. The dominance of mind over body in Stephen exemplifies the Apolline drive of denying a physical existence for a spiritual one.

This sets the reader up for a stark contrast in the next chapter when Bloom, a figure who is immensely dependent on sensual experience, is encountered for the first time: “Kidneys were in his mind as he moved about the kitchen softly, righting her breakfast things on the humpy tray. Gelid light and air were in the kitchen but out of doors gentle summer morning everywhere. Made him feel a bit peckish” (Joyce 45). Unlike Stephen, whose inner thoughts are erudite, allusive, and often
materialize in the form of poetry or foreign languages, Bloom's actions are directly narrated and he operates on a visceral level of engagement with his surroundings. This is apparent in the emphasis on the sensual qualities of his surroundings, which, rather than the sparse narration given of Stephen, give a more detailed picture of a physical reality, hence the "gelid light and air" and the feeling of being "peckish".

What arises from this positioning of the two main characters in relation to each other is the establishment, early on in the novel, of Joyce's characters' *modus operandi's*, which derive from the predominant creative drives associated with Dedalus's intellectualism (Apolline) and Bloom's sensuousness (Dionysiac). Furthermore, their direct juxtaposition, and the obvious insinuation of their roles in the Homeric framework (as Telemachus and Odysseus), suggests that the event of their encounter is the climactic point toward which the novel drives. Where we see the unification of the two creative drives, the Apolline-Dionysiac Genius, as Nietzsche calls it, is in the momentary pairings of these two hero types in which the action of the novel occurs, that is the convergence of the two main points of view.

To fully understand these encounters is to understand the relationship of the Apolline and Dionysiac drives to one another for Nietzsche. On their own, both drives are inherently flawed as a purely Apolline consciousness masks the primordial unity of nature and a purely Dionysian experience is self-destructive, yet when one coincides the primordial unification of Dionysian ecstasy with the ordering sensibilities of the Apolline consciousness, one reaches the ultimate state of creative expression and life affirmation, which Nietzsche identifies in the tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles: "Those appearances of the Sophoclean hero in
images of light, in other words, the Apolline quality of the mask, are the necessary result of gazing into the inner, terrible depths of nature—radiant patches, as it were, to heal a gaze seared by gruesome night” (Nietzsche, BT, 46). The effect of this cooperation between these two drives is present in the moments when the paths of Dedalus and Bloom converge.

The climactic union of these two characters is arguably their final meeting and point of departure in Chapter 17, Ithaca, in which the convergence of Dedalus and Bloom reaches its most Apolline clarity and Dionysiac unity. Harry Blamires, in *The New Bloomsday Book*, envisions ‘Ithaca’ as the ultimate communion between the two forces that drive the novel: “The artist and the intellectual meets the twentieth-century Everyman with his strong physical and material interests...Symbolically Godhead and manhood are joined, their respective natures mutually shared, Stephen and Bloom become ‘Blephen’ and ‘Stoom”’ (Blamires, 205-206). This reading of Ithaca reinforces the placement of emphasis of the creative drives within Joyce's characters, as Stephen is the Godhead and Bloom the Everyman. Stephen, the embodiment of Apolline artistry and intellect is thus juxtaposed to the Dionysian earthiness of Bloom, who is a mask of Dionysus himself as an Everyman:

Did Bloom discover common factors of similarity between their respective like and unlike reactions to experience?

Both were sensitive to artistic impressions, musical in preference to plastic or pictorial. Both preferred a continental to an insular manner of life, a cisatlantic to a transatlantic place of residence. Both indurated by early domestic training and an inherited tenacity of heterodox resistance professed their disbelief in many orthodox religious, national, social and ethical doctrines. Both admitted the alternately stimulating and obtunding influence of heterosexual magnetism.

Were their views on some points divergent?
Stephen dissented openly from Bloom’s views on the importance of dietary and civic selfhelp while Bloom dissented tacitly from Stephen’s views on the eternal affirmation of the spirit of man in literature.

While Stephen is the true “artist” of the two, Bloom lives more artistically, and yet, in this passage, they are simultaneously contrasted in their Apolline and Dionysiac selves, and aligned with one another in their artistic natures. In this final interaction between Dedalus and Bloom, the reader realizes the significance of the Nietzschean influence within Joyce’s text as the two faces, the two embodiments of Nietzsche’s creative drives that course through all human nature commune in a harmony of Apolline-Dionysiac forces. At the same time, Joyce goes beyond Nietzsche in granting both character the status of artist. Even in Chapter 10, Wandering Rocks, seemingly shallow and average Bloom is referred to in this light, “He’s a cultured allroundman, Bloom is, he said seriously. He’s not one of your common or garden...you know... There’s a touch of the artist about old Bloom” (Joyce 193).

Joyce’s characters, both artists, work to reflect the image of the tragic artist that arises in Nietzsche, a figure that engages the world metaphorically. The tragic artist, while reflected in his characters, is ultimately Joyce, the philosopher of the future who takes his creative hand to the tired metaphors of language to create his own values in literature.

Conclusion: Beyond Nietzsche

Having traversed the stylistic and conceptual similarities that join the pursuits of Joyce and Nietzsche in their will to create values, it becomes evident that Ulysses illuminates greater conceptual issues concerning the very relation between philosophy and literature. In Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity, Richard Rorty
engages the interaction that occurs between the pursuits of philosophy and literature, beginning with the human tendency to form truths by making languages in which to order consciousness. Rorty suggests that the likes of Nietzsche, Freud, and Wittgenstein produced the view we hold of ourselves within historical contingencies (such a view that Joyce depends on in *Ulysses*), as opposed to the subject-object, ahistorical world of past tradition. This all serves for Rorty's view that Literature achieves a sense of human solidarity that philosophy cannot: “To create one's mind is to create one's own language, rather than to let the length of one's mind be set by the language other human beings have left behind” (27). This notion exemplifies the shared will to power that drive Nietzsche and Joyce's texts while resisting the anchoring of dogmatic assertions, i.e. letting the “length of one's mind be set by the language other human beings have left behind”. Instead of situating himself within a literary tradition, Joyce disrupts that trajectory of thought through experimental literature, invoking the spirit of Nietzsche's revolutionarily approach to philosophy.

What gives Joyce such thrust to go beyond the project of Nietzsche's new philosopher-artist, and what Nietzsche's crowning achievement is in the realm of philosophy is its literary nature. Philosophy, as asserted by Rorty is inherently subordinate to the power of literature:

A culture in which Nietzschean metaphors were literalized would be one which took for granted that philosophical problems are as temporary as poetic problems, that there are no problems which bind the generations together into a single natural kind called ‘humanity.’ A sense of human history as the history of successive metaphors would let us see the poet, in the generic sense of the maker of new words, the shaper of new languages, as the vanguard of the species. (Rorty 20)
The poet, for Rorty, is this figure of pure creation, the individual driven by the Nietzschean will to create values. This very drive is what allows a reader of *Ulysses* to understand the Joycean challenge of awakening his audience from the slumber of traditional western literature. And finally, for Nietzsche, as with Rorty, it is the artist's spirit that triumphs over philosophical drives: "For usually in their case this delicate power stops where art ends and life begins; we, however, want to be poets of our lives, starting with the smallest and most commonplace details" (Nietzsche, GS, 169). For Nietzsche, the most effective form of philosophy is poetry, the best truth is perspectival, and the only reality is metaphorical. Once one gains an understanding of these Nietzschean principles, this call to be the poets of our lives, one discovers in Joyce's *Ulysses* the fruition of a "new literature" that shares, yet transcends in practice, the spirit of Nietzsche's "new philosophy".
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