Samuel Butler and James Joyce
—— Their Pursuit of the Father—Son Relationship ——

Shigehisa Yoshizu

(1)

It is said that the early and mid-Victorians were wonderfully concerned with religious controversy and ethical debate. The reading of sermons was the most popular of their literary pastimes. Walter Besant tells us that in the thirties the copyrights of the sermons of Robert Hall and Charles Simeon sold for four and five thousand pounds, respectively.[1)] But whatever their theological interests, their age was nonetheless in various ways devoted to the business of a material world which repeatedly denied the relevancy of their spiritual quest. If the Victorians had confessed more freely to their real motives, they might at least have been spared the charges of hypocrisy. But since they felt the need of rationalizing thier own daily conduct, all too frequently they sought some spiritual sanction for their roughshod material advance. Jerome H. Buckley emphasizes this contradictory aspect of the Victorian temper, quoting an ironical poem by Thomas Hood (1799—1845) which turned the charges of hypocrisy against his whole generation :

Behold yon servitor of God and Mammon,
Who, binding up his Bible with his ledger,
Blends Gospel texts with trading gammon,
A black-leg saint, a spiritual hedger,
Who backs his rigid Sabbath, so to speak,
Against the wicked remnant of the week,
A saving bet against his sinful bias—
"Rogue that I am," he whispers to himself,

"I lie—I cheat—do anything for pelf,
But who on earth can say I am not pious ?" [2]

Under these circumstances, Charles Kingsley felt compelled to warn his congregation that their faith was being surely undermined from within. He said, "It is certain that the very classes among us who are most utterly given up to money-making, are the very classes which, in all denominations, make the loudest religious profession, that our churches and chapels are crowded on Sundays by people whose souls are set, the whole week through, upon gain and nothing but gain." [3]

Samuel Butler (1835—1902) was conditioned to seeing his peculiar kind of household as typical of that of his contemporaries. His association was essentially with the old bourgeoisie of the liberal professions to which he belonged, and not with the new bourgeoisie of trade and industry who came to rise into power with the Industrial Revolution. His class had enjoyed rank and privilege in the eighteenth century and had come through the Industrial Revolution almost unchanged, with a lively sense of its own gentility and a steady allegiance to the Church of England as the church to which all really decent people belonged, as contrasted to the vulgarity of many of the newly rich bourgeoisie. His satire was produced and developed in this soil, and his charges of hypocrisy were turned against the generation of his father, typical of the old bourgeoisie. Samuel's father, Thomas Butler was a clergyman of the Church of England, and he took it for granted that his son would take the same profession. However, Samuel refused to accept the ordination and declared to be independent as a painter. This affair caused the long dispute between the father and the son over money. In Canon Butler's view, there were only two possible professions for a son who had rejected the ordination ; either a schoolmaster or a lawyer. He threatened Samuel that he would stop offering financial aid if his son would take neither of the two professions. This is the same in the case of Theobald Pontifex, a clergyman of the Church of England in *The Way Of All Flesh*, an autobiographical novel and a *bildungsroman* by Butler. Thebald is so timid and has so little self-will that he settles down very thoroughly to the life of a country gentleman. A clergyman in a village forces his

daughter Christina upon Theobald. She is chosen from among five daughters by playing at cards for Theobald. He cannot reject the ordained course of life forced on by his father-in law and his real father George Pontifex, and feels no qualms about sending his son Ernest Pontifex, with no questions asked, into the same vocation.

Samuel Butler strictly realized that parents' money brought forth their tyranny over their children. In *The Way Of All Flesh,* Overton, Ernest's godfather, remarks, "When a man is very fond of his money it is not easy for him at all times to be very fond of his children also. The two are like God and Mammon."[4] George's money was "never naughty ; his money never made noise or litter, and did not spill things on the tablecloth at meal tlmes, or leave the door open when it went out." [5] Butler thought the only way to become free from his parents' tyranny was to learn early the art of earning his money. Ernest asks himself:

> Why should the generations overlap one another at all ? Why cannot we be buried as eggs in neat little cells with ten or twenty thousand pounds each wrapped round us in Bank of England notes, and wak up, as the sphex wasp does, to find that its papa and mamma have not only left ample provision at its elbow, but have been eaten by sparrows some weeks before it began to live consciously on its own account ?[6]

Butler became more and more conscious of his class, the old bourgeoisie, being disqualified for meeting the demands of the times and for living in an age where the ability to win one's own bread counts for everything. He was very much concerned with the fact that the traditional education for the children of the old bourgeoisie prevented them from keeping abreast with the "materialism" and learning how to win their bread. He satirizes the Thomas Butlers in Erewhon (England) who send their children to the Colleges of Unreason (public schools, Oxford or Cambridge) for the Ydgrumworship (the conventional code, respectability and Christianity which have been reduced to a shell) to give them the hypothetical (classical) education. He bemoans the fact that this education for his own class has helped the parents to hinder the chil-

dren from their independence. He remarks in his Note-Books :

> The Family
>
> I believe that more unhappiness comes from this source than from any other—I mean from the attempt to prolong family connection unduly and to make people hang together artificially who would never naturally do so. The mischief among the lower classes is not so great, but among the middle and upper classes it is killing a large number daily. And the old people do not really like it much better than the young.[7]

Butler repeats this idea both in his satirical Utopian novel *Erewhon* and in his *bildungsroman The Way Of All Flesh.*

> ...with the less well-dressed classes the harm was not so great ; for among those, at about ten years old, the child has to begin doing something : if he is capable he makes his way up ; if he is not, he is at any rate not made more incapable by what his friends are pleased to call his education.[8]

The outlines of the Victorian era presented by the scholars blur beyond recognition in the confusion of contradictory changes. The Victorians, we are told, were "a poor, blind, complacent people" ; yet they were torn by doubt, spiritually bewildered, lost in a troubled universe (In a way they were stricken with shock to learn of Charles Darwin's "Natural Selection".). They were crass materialists, wholly absorbed in the present, quite unconcerned with abstract verities and eternal values, but they were excessively religious, lamentably idealistic, nostalgic for convention, and ready to forego present delights for the vision of a world beyond. Despite their slavish "conformity," their purblind respect for convention, they were, we learn, "rugged individualists," given to "doing as one likes," heedless of culture, careless of a great tradition ; they were iconoclasts who worshipped the idols of authority.[9] Butler's satire was turned against the hypocrisy in this soil—

especially the hypocrisy in religion represented by his father and that in education represented by schoolmasters of public schools and professors of Oxbridge. Butler's father, Thomas Butler, was a charming, benevolent, amiable person in the outward relationship of life, while, actuated by the highest moral principles as the code for men to live by and the only passport for salvation, he was the oppressor of his son. Samuel, on the other hand, had an enquiring spirit and a keen sense of justice, but his father cared little for justice and much for the conventional morality. Instead of giving Samuel straight answers to his questions, Thomas often put him off. So the son was always disappointed without getting any of the reasons why from the father. This evasiveness on the father's side is criticized as the representative of a law without faith or a religion of compromises attributed to the Church of England, and also criticized is the father's distinguishing peculiarity of not quite believing in any matter he professes himself to be quite certain about.

> Theobald does not like this branch of his profession – indeed he hates it ! – but will not admit it to himself. The habit of not admitting things to himself has become a confirmed one with him. Nevertheless there haunts him an ill defined sense that life would be pleasanter if there were no sick sinners, or if they would at any rate face an eternity of torture with more indifference. He does not feel that he is in his element. The farmers look as if they were in their element.[10)]

The system of the Church of England is ironically put in parallel with that of "The Musical Banks" in Erewhon. The currency of these banks has no commercial value in the outside world, just as the sermons of the Church of England has no value to the congregation. The people in Erewhon go to the Musical Banks to keep some balance there and to be considered respectable, just as those in England go to church to give their false faith to Heaven for respectability. A lady in Erewhon does not count the amount of the money handed by the cashier, but puts it into her purse and goes back to her seat after dropping a few pieces of the other coinage into an alms box. This implies the works without any

faith given to Heaven. About the unpopularity of the Musical Banks, a manager says, "It has been more or less true till lately ; but now we have put fresh stained glass windows into all the banks in the country, and repaired the buildings, and enlarged the organs ; the presidents, moreover, have taken to riding in omnibuses and talking nicely to people in the streets, and to remembering the ages of their children, and giving them things when they were naughty, so that all would henceforth go smoothly."[11] This outward respectability and the flattering of the presidents are also ridiculed in the case of Theobald. He finds scope for useful work in the rebuilding of Battersby Church where he was newly ordained, and he carries out the work at considerable cost, towards which he subscribes liberally himself, but the result is not satisfactory at all. His wife Christina complains that there can be nothing in common between Theobald and his parishioners, and that his ability is thrown away upon such a place. His habit is to trudge through muddy lanes and over long sweeps of plover-haunted pastures to visit a dying cottager's wife, taking her meat and wine from his own table. However, his rigid theology cannot satisfy and console the soul of the simple-minded farmer.

Erewhonians speak quite openly and freely that all currency save that of the Musical Banks should be abolished and that the current coin of the newly-establihed banks is dross in comparison with that of the Musical Banks ; and yet they know perfectly well that even the cashiers themselves hardly use the Musical Bank money more than other people. It is expected of them that they should appear to do so. The newly-established banks in Erewhon suggest the dissenting churches in England. In *The Way Of All Flesh,* there is a very ironical description of the rise of the dissenting churches and the fall of the Anglican Churches in popularity. Three parishioners who belong to a Church of England come out of a dissenting chapel with a look of satisfaction.

> But in the evening later on I saw three very old men come chuckling out of a dissenting chapel, and surely enough they were my old friends, the blacksmith, the carpenter and the shepherd. There was a look of content upon their faces.[12]

Samuel Butler's hatred of and revolt against the paternal hypocrisy and despotism forbade him to accept Charles Darwin's new theory of "Natural Selection" from among chance, or at least unexplained "variations" as the main force in the development of species. His inquiry for the way of free will led him to put the stress on the effects of conscious striving on the part of a child. He wanted to believe that the species changed and adapted themselves by trying and learning and were not merely passive victims of "Natural Selection". His critical comments on Darwin's new theory and his own theory on evolution were contributed to the *Press* in New Zealand from 1860 to 1864 where he emigrated after his refusal of the ordination, and they were combined into four books from 1877 to 1886. The following is the summary of the main points of Butler's theory on evolution.

He presents the notion that all machines are the extensions of the limbs as regards both being tools. However, our limbs have been designed with our intelligence for the particular uses they fulfil, just as man for his own purposes has designed, modified, and perfected with his intelligence those machines which exist outside himself. So complete an identification between means and ends could only have been realized intelligently. The problem then confronted him : how could the descendants of the primordial cell intelligently do their work when they knew nothing about it ? Butler answered that they did it by "Unconscious Memory," which was able to assert itself by reason of the oneness of personality between parents and offspring. Thus the return of the associated ideas awoke the memories proper to the occasion, and the creature is able to do things about which otherwise it could know nothing. To explain more concretely this hypothesis of a real continuity of memory between parents and children, he demonstrates how all the actions we do best we do unconsciously. To reach this height of unconscious proficiency it is clear that we must have done the action very many times before ; and, this, we know, is exactly the case with all the things we do most easily—breathing, digesting, the circulating of the blood. We usually admit that our intelligence works only when we do something consciously, and regard our unconscious work as just hereditary. One example clarifies his theory of "Unconscious Memory". When we

Japanese begin to learn English, we mistake the sound 'f' for 'h' , or we have trouble in pronouncing the sound 'th' or 'l'. However, as we practice and become proficient in English, we can pronounce 'f' exactly or tell 'f' from 'h' without trying to recall the rule, and our tongue sets itself in the right place when we try to pronounce 'th' or 'l'. Similarly our knowledge becomes an unconscious habit in proportion as it comes near perfection. Speaking English easily and perfectly is acquired by repeated trials and failures with intelligence. This can be applied to a baby's instinct on sucking milk. Since this notion is true, we must get rid of our prejudice that what we call personality begins at birth and ends at death. It is no more possible to deny identity between the baby of ten minutes old and the old man of eighty into which it developed, than to deny identity of personality between the embryo five minutes or five months before its birth as a baby and baby of ten minutes old. The embryo is related by the spermatozoon or the ovum to the father and the mother. We are related to the ancestors over ten millions of years. Traced back to the origin, all creatures are related to the primordium. Thus, the unerring nature of our unconscious action or the developed organs of our body is a proof of the force our past experiences exert within us : "Unconscious Memory". That was part of each individual's biological inheritance and could be passed or enriched by the new or improved habits formed during the individual's lifetime.

> What he (Butler) was rebelling against was, however, essentially the same thing as was anathema to Christians—the conception of the living universe, and of man as part of it, as ruled by the blind chance of unexplained biological variations selected by the inexorable laws of a purely material environment. He could make fun of the God of tradition ; but he could not bear to make such fun as this view seemed to make fun of man .... and he could not endure to think of himself, and of other men, as mere 'sports', with no real power to shape their own lives. What he was really looking for was a theory, not so much of biological, as of social, evolution, that would allow man a creative role not only as an individual, but as a link in a long chain of succeeding generations participating in a

sustained common effort.[13]

Butler's respect for the family as the great transmitting agency of acquired habits seems to be inconsistent with his horror of being trapped by his family, but he laid more emphasis on the child's business to modify the inherited habits and develop new ones.

> The child's business in life was not simply to take over what the parents transmitted, but to build something new on the foundations thus provided ; and Butler saw this as involving an incessant conflict between the parents' wish to keep the child in the old grooves and the child's creative urge to escape—not from his inheritance, but from being limited by it in shaping his own course.[14]

(2)

Samuel Butler's theory on evolution lived on in the works of the writers in later years, especially those who produced their own *bildungsromans* early in this century. Stephen Dedalus, the 'son'protagonist called "Japhet in search of a father" in *Ulysses* by James Joyce (1882—1941), discloses through his internal monologue that he, at every moment, keeps on doing a child's duty to build something new on the foundations inherited through his "Unconscious Memory" which was acquired as the result of his conscious self having repeated trials and failures with intelligence over the past generations.

> Wait. Five months. Molecules all change.
> I am other I now. Other I got pound.
> Buzz. Buzz.
> But I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory because under everchanging forms.
> I that sinned and prayed and fasted.
> A child Conmee saved from pandies.
> I, I and I. I.

A. E. I. O. U. [15]

"Entelechy" in the above quotation is a term coined by Aristotle for that which realizes or makes actual the otherwise merely potential.[16] The idea expressed by the term is intimately connected with Aristotle's distinction between matter and form or the potential and the actual. Briefly, he analyzed each thing into the stuff or elements of which it is composed and the form of the order in which they are arranged. The mere stuff or matter is not yet the real thing ; it needs what is variously described as a certain form or essence or funciton to complete it ; only it must be remembered that matter and form are never separated ; they can only be distinguished. So, for example, in the case of a living organism one may distinguish the mere matter of the organism (as though it were a mere synthesis of inorganic substances) from a certain form or essence or function or inner activity without which it would not really be a living organism at all ; and this "soul"or the function as it may be called is what Aristotle calls the *entelechy* (or first entelechy) of a living organism. Similarly, in the case of man rational activity is what makes him really a man, as distinguished from a mere animal, and so on. Leibniz, following Aristotle, called his "monads" (spiritual substances) entelechies in virtue of their inner self-determined activity. Later the term was revived by Hans Driesch in connection with his vitalistic biology to denote an internal perfecting principle which, he supposed , exists in all living organism.

As mentioned above, the entelechy is the soul or form or function or inner activity which transforms the mere flesh or matter into a living organism, and it is no wonder that Butler's "intelligence" or "the life force"which was the main factor to bring about the "Unconscious Memory" corresponds to the "entelechy" Joyce adopted. Both Butler and Joyce wanted the design of the universe and the living organism of an individual to come from within, and neither from an external divine design nor from among chance or unexplained "variations" Darwin asserted in his theory of "Natural Selection" which promoted the father's despotism and deprived the son of his creative energy. Their whole nature revolted against the idea that the universe was without in-

telligence. They could not return to the Jewish and Christian idea of God designing his creatures from outside. They saw, however, no reason why the intelligence should not be inside—so they incorporated God within the creatures as the life force.

Stephen Dedalus, as above quoted, asks himself, "But I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory because under everchanging forms." This motif "I, entelechy, form of forms" springs to Stephen's mind throughout the novel. In Episode II (Nestor) of *Ulysses,* through Stephen's mind who is giving a history lesson to his pupils at Mr. Deasy's school, thoughts flash of the motif : "The soul is in a manner all that is : the soul is the form of forms. "[17] History is the "art" of this episode as the subject stephen is teaching, as Stuart Gilbert indicates. [18] Stephen says to Mr. Deasy, "History ... is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake."[19] What he means by history in this case is, in a narrow sense, the bloody history of Ireland under the cruel control of England. However, he means not only that. In a broader sense, he means the history of mankind assumed by the determinismistic or fatalismistic viewpoint of history. Mr. Deasy is an advocate of this viewpoint which Stephen rejects. Mr. Deasy, who is a rather pompous old gentleman and conservative in outlook, is always ready to dispense sage counsel to young Stephen Dedalus[20] who plays the role of a spiritual son. According to Mr. Deasy's concept of history, the wretched conditions under which Ireland is placed at present was caused by the sins committed by married women and that was the natural result determined by the original sin committed by Eve.

> We have committed many errors and many sins. A woman brought sin into the world. For a woman who was no better than she should be, Helen, the wife of Menelaus, ten years the Greeks made war on Troy . A faithless wife first brought the strangers to our shore here, MacMurrough's wife and her leman, O'Rourke, prince of Belfini. A woman too brought Parnell low ...[21]

Mr. Deasy's comment on the cause of the strangers' invasion into Ireland is partly contrary to the historical fact. Edna O'Brien remarks that

Devorgilla, wife of Breifne O'Rourke, being enamoured of Dermot MacMurrough, Prince of Leinster, took advantage of her husband's absense and yielded herself to Dermot to have love and lust satisfied. When the cuckolded O'Rourke heard of this wrong, he went to the High King Rothorike and got aid to invade Leinster. On the other hand, Dermot's own assembly refused to help him and so he deserted his place and fled to enlist help from Henry II, King of England, and was received with grace and benevolence into the King's bosom.[22] This made it inevitable that Ireland should be invaded by the powerful Saxons, her neighbours across the Irish Sea. Mr. Deasy concludes the humiliating rule of England over Ireland is the historical necessity brought about by the original sin committed by Eve and the immoral conducts by her followers. Also, he regards the fate of the Jews as the historical necessity determined by their original sin : " They sinned against the light ... And you can see the darkness in their eyes. And that is why they are wanderers on the earth to this day."[23] Then, he presents his determinismistic viewpoint of history in case of the future this time : " The ways of the creator are not our ways, ... All human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God." [24] On the other hand, Stephen, who is trying to awake from the nightmare of history or to break away from the yoke of its fatalism, finds solution in the Aristotelian definition of history as a "movement" : "a movement ..., an actuality of the possible as possible." [25] Thus, Stephen seeks for the possibility of considering history as a "movement" and regarding every point or time in history and, above all, "the now and the here" [26] as the "playfield" where the countless possible are battling hoping for their actuality,[27] for the "form of forms". While having a talk with Mr. Deasy, Stephen hears a shout raised by the boys playing hockey in the playfield : "from the playfield the boys raised a shout. A whirring whistle : goal." [28] This is a metaphor of history as a "movement", and it is in opposition to Mr. Deasy's determinismistic concept of history : "All human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God." Stephen wishes to be freed from the state of " being fettered and lodged in the room of the infinite possibilities ousted by time, the facts of history." So, he reacts favorably to the "movement" : "Shouts rang shrill from the boys' play-

field and a whirring whistle. Again, a goal. I am among them, among their battling bodies in a medley, the joust of life." [29] Then, his inner voice orders him to " Hold to the now, the here, ... " [30] This is in ironical contrast with the references to the "hollow shells" which Mr. Deasy collects : " Stephen's embarrased hand moved over the shells heaped in the cold stone mortar : whelks and money cowries and leopard shells : and this, whorled as an emir's turban, and this, the scallop of Saint James. An old pilgrim's hoard, dead treasure, hollow shells." [31] The shells here are the metaphor of the facts of history which have been passed on and cannot be recalled. They designate the bodies discarded by the soul, the tenements emptied of life, while the melee of history, "joust of life," is ever pushing forward to new fronts, leaving on the abandoned field a debris of discarded vehicles, empty shells.[32]

The Aristotelian definition of history as a "movement" in which Stephen finds solution is related to the same philosopher's theory of "entelechy"—the idea of the "matter" and the "form" which was already mentioned in this paper. Stephen once asked himself, "But I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory because under everchanging forms ... " (Quotation 15) Also, he remarked, " The soul is in a manner all that is : the soul is the form of forms." (Quotation 17) In Stephen's soul, various "forms" are watching their chance for their actuality, such as Daedalus, Icarus, Telemachus, Hamlet, Shakespeare, Moses, and others, just as many boys are battling their bodies to make a goal in the playfield outside. By thinking this way, Stephen tries to set himself free from the historical determinism which confines his soul, "fettered and lodged in the room of the infinite possibilities they (the facts of history) have ousted," and he regards himself as the owner of a great potential. And this is the manifestation of the son's inner self-determined activity against the father's wish to keep his son in the old grooves, the experience Butler and Joyce shared. So, it is natural that Stephen is motivated to search for and identify himself with the father of his soul, overcoming the fetters of the physical bonds with his father, as he found the "form" of Daedalus in his soul who succeeded in setting himself free from the labyrinth into the vast and free world of the sky.

This is Stephen's conclusion on the father-son relationship :

> A father ... is a necessary evil ... Fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting, is unknown to man. It is mystical estate, an apostolic succession, from only begetter to only begotten ... *Amor matris,* subjective and objective genitive, may be the only true thing in life. Paternity may be a legal fiction. Who is the father of any son that any son should love him or he any son ? [33]

> Wombed in sin darkness *I was too, made not begotten.* By them, the man with my voice and my eyes and a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath. They clasped and sundered, did the couple's will. From before the ages He willed me and now may not will me away or ever. *A lex eterna* stays about him. Is that then the divine substance wherein Father and Son are consubstantial ? [34]

Ernest Pontifex in *The Way Of All FIesh* by Samuel Butler also listens to the voice of his spiritual father, the God within, who made him, not to his physical father who begot him :

> You are surrounded on every side by lies which would deceive even the elect, if the elect were not generally so uncommonly wide awake ; the self of which you are conscious, your reasoning and reflecting self, will believe these lies and bid you act in accordance with them. This conscious self of yours, Ernest, is a prig begotten of prigs and trained in priggishness ; I will not allow it to shape your actions ... Obey *me,* your true self ... for I, Ernest, am the God who *made* you.[35]

In the Episode of " Cyclops" of *Ulysses,* there is an incessant declaration that a person's "name" represents merely his superficial "matter" irrelevant to "form" or "soul". It claims that a person's "soul" is not always inherited from his father, though his "matter"or "flesh" is. The fixed name of Stephen Dedalus given by his father, Simon Dedalus, does not always represent his inner actuality, as he once said through his internal monologue, " But I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory because under everchanging forms." (Quotation 15) In the Ninth Episode

of *Ulysses*, Stephen exclaims, " What's in a name ? That is what we ask ourselves in childhood when we write the name that we are told is ours."[36] It is needless to say that this is the echo of Juliet's question why her lover's name should be Romeo Montague which is no part of him.

> *Ju.* 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy ;
> Thou art thyself, though not a Montague.
> What's Montague ? it is nor hand nor foot,
> Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O, be some other name !
> *What's in a name ?* that which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet ;
> So : Romeo would, were he not Romeo call' d,
> Retain that dear perfection which he owes
> Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name,
> And for that name which is no part of thee
> Take all myself.[37]

The person who plays the role of Cyclops in the Twelfth Episode of *Ulysses* is "nameless," merely called "the citizen". Also, the man who describes the public house is called "Nameless One." Those nameless people rule the world of Ulysses in Dublin in 1904, and have a strong desire for oppressing the Jew, Leopold Bloom who is one of the minorities, by trying to connect the name of "Leopold Bloom" with his inner actuality forged by them. They give him several names such as "bloody freemason," "Ahasuerus" ("Wandering Jew cursed by God,") "whiteeyed kaffir," "Mean bloody scut," "One of those mixed middlings he is," "A fellow that's neither fish nor flesh" ... Against these oppessors, Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus repeat the words, "What's in a name ?"

> — *Sounds are impostures, Stephen said after a pause of some little time, like names.* Cicero, Podmore Napoleon, Mr Goodbody, Jesus, Mr Doyle, Shakespeares were as common as Murphies. What's in a name ?

— Yes, to be sure, Mr Bloom. unaffectedly concurred. Of course. Our name was changed too, he added pushing the socalled roll across.[38]

Notes

1) Walter Besant, *Fifty Years Ago* (New York, n. d.) p. 124
2) Jerome Hamilton Buckley, *The Victorian Temper*, (Vintage Books, New york, 1951), p. 109
3) Charles Kingsley, "God and Mammon", *Westminster Sermons*, (London, 1874), pp. 293–294, quoted in *The Victorian Temper*.
4) Samuel Buter, *The Way Of All Flesh*, with introduction by Theodore Dreiser, (New York, 1936), p. 30
5) *Ibid.*, p. 31
6) *Ibid.*, pp. 115–116
7) Henry Festing Jones, ed., *The Note–Books of Samuel Butler*, (New York, 1917), p. 31
8) Samuel Butler, *Erewhon*, with an afterword by Kingsley Amis, (New York, 1960), pp. 153–154
9) *The Victorian Temper*, p. 2
10) *The Way Of All Flesh*, p. 97
11) *Erewhon*, p. 119
12) *The Way Of All Flesh*, p. 92
13) G. D. H. Cole, *Samuel Butler*, (Longmans, 1952), p. 30
14) *Ibid.*, p. 31
15) James Joyce, *Ulysses*, Episode IX, (Penguin Modern Classics, 1984), p. 156
16) The comments given here on "entelechy" is the summary of the definition in *Britanica*.
17) *Ulysses*, Episode II, p. 21
18) Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's Ulysses*, (Random House, N. Y., 1958), p. 108
19) *Ulysses*, Episode II, pp. 28–29
20) *James Joyce's Ulysses*, p. 111
21) *Ulysses*, Episode II, pp. 28–29
22) Edna O' Brien, *Mother Ireland*, (Penguin Books, 1988), p. 15
23) *Ulysses*, Episode II, pp. 28–29
24) *Ibid.*, Episode II, pp. 28–29
25) *Ibid.*, Episode II, p. 21
26) *Ibid.*, Episode IX, p. 153
27) Ai Tanji, "About the Nestor Episode in Ulysses" (in Japanese), *Joycean Japan, No.3*, (Nippon Joyce Kyokai Jimukyoku, June 16, 1992), pp. 85–86.

The present writer of this paper was given a great deal of informative suggestions concerning the concepts of history in "Nestor" Episode by this article and others which were carried in the above transactions.

28) *Ulysses*, pp. 28–29
29) *Ibid.*, Episode Ⅱ, p. 21, p. 27
30) *Ibid.*, Episode Ⅸ, p. 153
31) *Ibid.*, Episode Ⅱ, p. 25
32) *James Joyce's Ulysses*, p. 115
33) *Ulysses*, Episode Ⅸ, p. 170
34) *Ibid.*, Episode Ⅲ, p. 32
35) *The Way Of All Flesh*, p. 190
36) *Ulysses*, Episode Ⅸ, p. 172
37) W. Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, Ⅱ, ⅱ, 38–49
38) *Ulysses*, Episode ⅩⅥ, p. 509
Concerning the controversy over the matter of "names," there is a good article by Akira Tamura in *Joycean Japan*, No. 3.