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Introduction

This paper deals with “Telemachia” of James Joyce’s Ulysses, that is, the first three episodes, “Telemachus,” “Nestor,” and lastly “Proteus,” from an historical point of view. “Telemachia” was named by Joyce after the original structure of the Odyssey. In the first three episodes of “Telemachia,” Stephen departs from Martello Tower, teaches history to children at a private school, and walks along the shore meditating on something philosophical. His long walking journey for the day around the city of Dublin starts in “Telemachia.”

In Homer’s Odyssey, Telemachus travels to the home of Nestor, an old soldier, to hear about his father, Odysseus, who went to the Trojan War but has not yet returned. He then goes on to the home of Menelaus, where he listens to Menelaus’ talk about Proteus, the protean sea-god with the ability to predict the future. By following the basic story of chapters one, two, and three of the Odyssey, Joyce depicted Stephen searching for his spiritual father in Part I of Ulysses.

The aim of this paper is to analyze these three episodes, especially with the help of the idea of the New Historicism. It was first introduced to literary criticism by Stephen Greenblatt in 1980, when he published Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare to discuss the dynamic relationship between the life and the works of literary men in the English Renaissance.

Joyce’s Ulysses has been an object of eager argument from the historical aspect of the novel. Stephen’s definition of history as a nightmare is all too well-known to Joyce scholars: “History... is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake.” (U 2.377) Stephen’s quest for the ideal father and artist begins by asking himself several questions: “What is history?” and “What does history represent to the Irish people?” and “How should men realize the aim of history?” For him, history is indispensable to achieve the goal of the future life of an artist.

I. “Telemachus”: Stephen and Mulligan as a Usurper

“Usurper,” the last word of “Telemachus”, symbolizes treachery, heresy, oppression, false prophecy, and so on. Basically, in the Odyssey, usurpers mean the suitors who woo Penelope in order to seek the throne. In Ulysses, the relationship between Stephen and Mulligan, or the one between Stephen and Haines, is parallel to the strife of Telemachus and the suitors. In the same way, this kind of usurpation implies the opposing relationship between Hamlet and Claudius to gain succession to the throne.

Stephen’s consciousness of being usurped or oppressed comes from the problem of the possession of the Martello Tower’s key. Stephen, Mulligan, and Haines inhabit the tower together. In real life, Joyce got into trouble with Oliver Saint John Gogarty, the model for Mulligan, over the ownership of the key. Joyce described Mulligan as a treacherous, heretic, oppressive person.
Moreover, Mulligan was regarded as a fake priest who presided over the black mass in the very beginning of *Ulysses*.

One critic’s view of Mulligan is so harsh: Stanley Sultan, for example, criticizes him by saying that “Mulligan is selfish, cynical, gluttonous, traitorous... and a devastatingly sincere materialist. Toward Stephen, he is disloyal and finally treacherous.” In return, Stephen counterattacks Mulligan, because he thinks that he was hurt and insulted by how Mulligan regarded his mother’s death. So, Stephen ridicules him as one of the heretics: “A horde of heresies fleeing with mitres awry: Photius and the brood of mockers of whom Mulligan was one, and Arius... and Valentine... and... Sabellius...” * (U 1. 656-59)

All of the aspects that Mulligan takes on are concerned with the whole theme of *Ulysses*, and foreshadow the problems which Stephen has to solve: history, heresy, oppression, and treachery. Mulligan, in this respect, is Stephen’s stepping-stone to understanding himself.

There is another aspect of Mulligan as “Mercurial Malachi.” * (U 1. 518) In the consciousness of Stephen, Mulligan is compared to Hermes in Greek mythology, who is one of the Olympian gods, called Mercurius in Latin and Mercury in English. Hermes was worshipped as the god of commerce and transmission, and also he took on the role of the messenger of Zeus. Moreover, he was believed to be the guiding god who led the dead souls to the other world. Joyce wrote about Hermes in a letter to Frank Budgen, as follows:

*Moly* is a nut to crack. My latest is this. Moly is the gift of Hermes, the god of public ways and is the invisible influence (prayer, chance, agility, presence of mind, power of recuperation) which saves in case of accident... Hermes is the god of signposts; i.e. he is, specially for a traveller like Ulysses, the point at which roads parallel merge and roads contrary also. He is an accident of Providence. *

Hermes was described as wearing a cap with wings and sandals with wings, with the golden staff of Kelyukaeon in his hand.

According to the biographical book of Stanislaus Joyce, Gogarty and James Joyce once went out to the Hermetic Society to look for AE (George Russel) well-known for mysticism in the late nineteenth century of Ireland. Stanislaus Joyce explained what the Hermetic Society was like by saying that “the Hermetic Society was a place where young would-be mystics met under the brooding wings of ‘Their master dear’ to read esoteric poetry, hear discourse of the Father, Son and ‘Holy Breath,’ and generally to discuss the dreamy and visionary short cut to the solution of the riddle of the Universe.” “Hermetic” means “hidden” or “occult” and “of Hermes Trismegistus” as well as “alchemistic.”

On the other hand, “Malachi” means not only “my messenger” in Hebrew but also the prophet of the Old Testament. Malachi, the author of the last book of the Old Testament, foretold the coming of the prophet Elijah before the coming of the Saviour.
In the *Odyssey*, Hermes, as a messenger of Zeus, protected the wandering Odysseus from Calypso and Circe. In this regard, Hermes as a messenger and Malachi as a prophet are incorporated into the ironical epithet, “Mercurial Malachi.” Mulligan encourages Stephen to transform Irish culture into the Greek one: “God, Kinch, if you and I could only work together we might do something for the island. Hellenise it.” *(U 1. 157-58)* Instead of accepting Mulligan’s encouragement, Stephen makes fun of Mulligan by calling him “Mercurial Malachi” in jest.

Implications and associations of Hermes emerge again in Stephen’s imagination in “Proteus” like this: “My cockle hat and staff and hismy sandal shoon” *(U 3. 487-88)* and “AE, primander, good shepherd of men.” *(U 3. 227-28)* In the hallucination of “Circe,” George Russell is seen crying, “Occult primander of Hermes Trismegistos” in “the bearded figure of Mananaun MacLir.” *(U 15. 2269, 2262)*

In the Renaissance, Hermeticism was the principal, but hidden notion of culture and religion. Its nature consisted in occult, talisman, magic, gnosis, astronomy, cyclical time, and so on. These ideas expounded on in *Corpus Hermeticus* were supposed to be written by Hermes Trismegistus, namely “Thrice Great Hermes.” The first book of *Corpus Hermeticus* was titled “Primander.” Frances Yates, the great scholar of the Renaissance, said that “[t]he Egyptian God, Thoth, the scribe of the gods and the divinity of wisdom, was identified by the Greeks with their Hermes and sometimes given the epithet of ‘Thrice Great.’”  In Hermeticism actually implies “a religion, a cult without temples or liturgy, followed in the mind alone, a religious philosophy or philosophical religion containing a gnosis.”

The main concept of mysticism or occultism was based on the cyclical notion of “from body to soul and from soul to body.” Human souls in the spiritual world come down to the material world, and again after death, they go up to the spiritual world in the cyclical movement. The recurring movement of this kind, that is, the idea of metempsychosis was most significant in the ancient times. This cyclical view was transfused with the distinctive Egyptian spiritualism, and then, the Egyptian spiritualism was transformed into the idea of the revival. The Egyptian idea of revival supposedly penetrated into Christianity, and, as a result, it caused the miracle of the Resurrection.

According to Frances Yates, Hebraic gnosticism and Hermetic one, originating from Moses and Hermes Trismegistus respectively, were fundamentally similar to each other. However, in the history of Christianity, Gnosticism was excluded from the orthodox doctrine. Interestingly, in Stephen’s
thought in "Telemachus," Mulligan was treated as the same heretic as Photius, one of the significant founders of Gnostic Christianity in the second century of Alexandria: "Photius and the brood of mockers of whom Mulligan was one..." (U1. 656-57)

Mulligan, a materialistic medical student, expresses his cruel opinion of death and irritates Stephen’s grief over his mother’s death: "—And what is death, he [Mulligan] asked, your mother’s or yours or my own? You saw only your mother die. I see them pop off every day in the Mater and Richmond and cut up into tripes in the dissecting room. It’s a beastly thing and nothing else. It simply doesn’t matter." (U1. 204-07) For Mulligan, death means to "pop off" and to be "cut up into tripes in the dissecting room." His idea of death is influenced by too materialistic a way of thinking.

The combination of "Mercurial" and "Malachi" looks as if Hellenism was united with Hebraism. And also, gnosis of Hermes and materialism of Mulligan are ironically mixed with each other in the epithet such as "Mercurial Malachi."

II. "Nestor": Stephen and Deasy as a Teleologist

According to Linati schema of Ulysses, "science" or "art" shifts from "theology" in "Telemachus" to "history" in "Nestor." In this way, "[surer]," the last word of "Telemachus," is linked with the scene of teaching history in the beginning of "Nestor." The repeated topics of "Nestor" in question have been about Stephen’s speculations on history as a nightmare. He rejects the common sense of history, that is, the chronological explanation of the past events. While rebelling against official history such as the discourse written in textbooks of history, Stephen, as a temporary teacher, was forced to teach history at the private school in Dalkey, Dublin.

As Joyce tried to present the myth of the twentieth century in the eternal phase by the application of Homeric myth to the structure of Ulysses, so in Finnegans Wake, he tried to represent the history of men by the application of Vico’s cyclical view of history to the framework of the book. Joyce said to his friends at one time, "I don’t take Vico’s speculations literally; I use his cycles as a trellis." Furthermore, he once wrote in the letter to his literary, financial patron, Harriet Shaw Weaver, about the construction of his new work, later titled officially as Finnegans Wake: "Patrick and [P] Berkeley are unsuccessful in explaining themselves. The answer, I suppose, is that given by Paddy Dignam’s apparition: metempsychosis. Or perhaps the theory of history so well set forth (after Hegel and Giambattista Vico) by the four eminent annalists...."

The method of Finnegans Wake suggests Joyce’s scrupulous attempt to free himself from the tragical history of Ireland by resorting to "a commodius vicus of recirculation." (FW 3. 2) "Vico road, Dalkey" (U 2. 25) was no more than the name of the real road, but with the publication of Finnegans Wake in 1939, the word "Vico" turned out to be a proleptic one as well as coincidental discourse, and led to the wide range of exposition of historical discourse in Finnegans Wake.

Deasy’s explanation of history is characteristic of the Victorian idea of history, the Hegelian history of philosophy, and the teleological view of history. Robert Spoo analyzes as follows: "With Deasy’s ‘manifestation of God’ pronouncement, teleology makes its grand thematic entrance in Ulysses. This view of history has been variously called providentialist, developmental, Whig, and Hegelian." Stepney’s mission in life is to reject the traditional discourse of history. His rebellious feelings toward Deasy’s British historical view are precisely reflected in the "brutish empire." (U 15.
For Stephen, Deasy’s understanding of history looks as if it were the nightmarish history, from which he tries to awake. Stephen longs strongly to be delivered from the providential course of history, which Deasy preaches earnestly to him: “The ways of the Creator are not our ways,... All human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God.” (U 2. 380-81)

In The Philosophy of History, Hegel insisted that reason of world spirit should preside over the history of world. World history goes on teleologically under Providence. Even though there happen to be terrible disasters and wars in the world, world history will advance to achieve the ideal in the long run. Even though the fights or confrontations between the races and between the countries are seemingly considered the strife of each regional gods, they, from the providential point of view, might be only the manifestation of human egoism repeated by men forever. Thus, we witness “history repeating itself with a difference.” (U 16. 1525-26) Our task imposed by God could be the establishment of the supreme civilization in each time in each place.

Hegel says that “a Providence (that of God) presides over the events of the World.” He goes on to say that “this idea—that Reason directs the World—...the world is not abandoned to chance and external contingent causes, but that a Providence controls it” and that “Divine Providence is Wisdom, endowed with an infinite Power, which realizes its aim, viz., the absolute rational design of the World.” When we know about Hegel’s theory of history, world history is so esoteric that human intellect cannot comprehend it. In a similar way, for Stephen, world history seems to hold the mythical, profound riddles and mysteries in itself. If history cannot be comprehended by human wisdom, the significance of history or historical discourse tends to take on ideological tendency, in which the aim of Marx criticism consists. It is human work for a man to interpret history ideologically without paying any attention to the intervention and will of Providence. In this way, in Marx criticism, history is regarded as follows: “history... is... a transcendent category which no narrative can comprehend.”

The critics’ estimations of Garret Deasy, the schoolmaster of the private school at Dalkey where Stephen teaches, are on the whole harsh. He was portrayed as an old bigot, an arrogant schoolmaster, an anti-Semite and pro-British full of prejudices and misunderstandings, and even a misogynist. To take some examples, Robert Spoo characterizes Deasy as “a happy warrior of the nineteenth-century type, full of hardy Victorian optimism and high-sounding imperiastic rhetoric, exactly the type who promoted and welcomed the war and continued to defend it even after it had become a nightmare.” Stanley Sultan evaluates Deasy in the following way: “That vain, petty, avaricious, and uncharitable man [Deasy] not only accepts history but glorifies it, and, so, eagerly embraces the historical role allotted him as an Irishman: servant and admirer of English pomp and power.”

The confrontation between Stephen and Deasy can be interpreted as the symbolic relation between Ireland as servant and Britain as master. Deasy plays the role of a master and employer, but, after all, he is no more than the old man to be repudiated and detested by the skeptical Stephen. Deasy assumes the surrogate father of Stephen indeed, but he isn’t worthy of patriarchal responsibility. He looks like the antagonist to Stephen as protagonist. Thus, Daniel Schwarz is also very critical of Deasy: “Deasy is a debased version of Nestor, the somewhat pompous but well-meaning old warrior who enjoys dispensing wisdom based on his practical experience. While Nestor
is a benign false father figure for Telemachus, Deasy is a malicious one for Stephen.” (7) He continues to say about Deasy’s characterization: “Ironically, Deasy, the bigoted anti-Semitic schoolmaster whose wisdom consists of clichés rather than experience, is not even of sufficient stature to be a Polonius figure.” (8)

Deasy’s teleological and dialectical theory of history is supposed to be the history of the conquerors or winners viewed from the British people. However, Stephen thinks that a man must take into full consideration the possibilities ousted from the history, the events omitted from the main stream of history, and the persons erased from historical incidents. “History,” says John Vincent Cheng, “is seen by Stephen as a usurper and a destroyer of creative potential, a restrictive force which limits other, perhaps more interesting, possibilities.” (9) Stephen sympathizes with the history of the suppressed and the loser. For Stephen, the history of Britain and the history of Ireland are correspondent with the winner and the loser. Ireland has been burdened with “the whole bloody history.” (U 7, 676-77) Stephen apprehends that Ireland will never be released from “[n]ightmare from which you will never awake.” (U 7, 678) The understanding of history is cruel for Stephen, because “[f]or them [Englishmen] too history was a tale like any other too often heard, their land a pawnshop.” (U 2, 46-47)

Stephen declares himself as “a servant of two masters,” which are “an English and an Italian.” (U 1, 638) He admits that he is forced to serve under “[t]he imperial British state” and “the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church.” (U 1, 643-44) That is why Stephen feels uncontrollable, unspeakable indignation and humiliation toward Mulligan, Haines, and Deasy, who all condescend to master over him. For Stephen, they are not masters at all, but are usurpers to be despised. Stephen “feels oppressed by history, which he sees as the record of the world’s battles and conquests and assassinations, and which he associates with the brute fact of death, especially his mother’s.” (10) Declan Kiberd summarizes the discussion of nightmarish history impressively:

Like all colonised peoples whose history is a nightmare, the Irish have no choice but to live in the foregloow of a golden future. For them history is a form of science fiction, by which their scribes must rediscover in the endlessly malleable past whatever it is they are hoping for in an ideal future. (11)

On the other hand, Deasy’s narrative of history is full of old clichés, and old-fashioned sayings:

The inside of the tower in 2002: “He was raving all night about a black panther” (U 1, 57)
"We have committed many errors and many sins" \((U\ 2\ 389-90)\) and "To learn one must be humble. But life is the great teacher." \((U\ 2\ 406-07)\) Similarly, Haines' idea of history results from the evasion of responsibility. Haines, an Oxford student who came to Ireland to study Celtic customs and language, shares the Martello Tower with Stephen and Mulligan. Haines doesn't care for the pain and grief of the oppressed at all: "Of course I'm a Britisher." \((U\ 1\ 666)\) "We feel in England that we have treated you rather unfairly. It seems history is to blame." \((U\ 1\ 648-49)\)

If we think of history from Deasy's point of view, his discourse of history contains some truth. Even if he is called the nineteenth century optimist, the dialectic Hegelian historian, or "an old fogey and an Tory" \((U\ 2\ 268)\), the history of Ireland advanced itself as Deasy saw it under the name of God: "I [Deasy] saw three generations since O'Connell's time. I remember the famine in '46. Do you know that the orange lodges agitated for repeal of the union twenty years before O'Connell did or before the prelates of your communion denounced him as a demagogue? You fenians forget some things." \((U\ 2\ 268-72)\)

Deasy must be a sage who has acquired a lot of wisdom through the experience of hardship in history. So, "Mr. Deasy is not...a serious contender for spiritual fatherhood in Ulysses; he plays Polonius to Stephen's Hamlet. But like Polonius, Mr. Deasy sometimes speaks the truth, even though he may drown it in a deluge of cliché." \(\text{[32]}\) Deasy embodies the history of nightmare from which Stephen must awake, while Deasy advocates the providential theory of history. "According to Deasy, history's nightmares are merely phases of God's dream of himself." \(\text{[33]}\)

Stephen cannot absolutely acknowledge that the history of nightmare might be controlled by God. He asks himself why God permits the existence of such a brutish history. God knows the truth. Inevitably, Joyce allotted to Deasy an ironical, contradictory part of nightmarish history and providential history. Stephen's discourse of history, therefore, seems to be controlled by the antinomy of nightmare versus providence.

III. "Proteus": Stephen and Self-Discovery of Himself

The main discussion of "Proteus" stems from the implications and the symbols of Stephen's protean philosophical speculations, which are associated with the thoughts of Aristotle, Aquinas, Berkeley, and Lessing. So, "Proteus" begins like this: "Inextensible modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes." \((U\ 3\ 1-2)\) Stephen's interior monologue is centered on the question of how the self and the outer world can be recognized; in other words, how the dialogue of the self and the others can be organized. The confrontation between Stephen and Mulligan as a usurper in "Telemachus," and the dialogue between Stephen and Deasy as an oppressor in "Nestor," in a sense, are equivalent to self-recognition to be achieved through the contact with the others. To put it in a nutshell, this is a kind of an initiation ceremony.

In "Proteus," however, the confrontation with the others recurs to the talk with the self. Stephen, walking alone in Sandymount strand, meditates on how he should explore the relationship of himself and the outer world or the history. In "Circe," Lynch says, "He [Stephen] likes dialectic..." \((U\ 15\ 4726)\) At first, Stephen struggled face to face with Mulligan and Deasy, and then, he became involved with self-reflection, and finally, he tries to come into new realization of history.

In "Nestor," Stephen's imagination comes into the apocalyptic vision like the romantic poet's
imagination, and in "Proteus," it goes on in the dialogue between himself and the exterior world.

Fabled by the daughters of memory. And yet it was in some way if not as memory fabled it. A phrase, then, of impatience, thud of Blake’s wings of excess. I hear the ruin of all space, shattered glass and toppling masonry, and time one livid final flame. What’s left us then? (U 2. 7-10)

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.

See now. There all the time without you: and ever shall be, world without end. (U 3. 25-28)

The world exists regardless of Stephen’s intention. He asks himself why men are blind to an invisible God’s will and how men are able to get a glimpse of eternity in the visible changing world. His quest for the answer never comes to an end.

In “Telemachus,” Stephen thinks jokingly he saw the manifestation of God in “[a] shout in the street.” (U 2. 386) On the contrary, Deasy regards history as the manifestation of God. If so, it is no wonder for us to remember Stephen’s definition of epiphany: “By an epiphany he [Stephen] meant a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether in the vulgarity of speech or of gesture or in a memorable phase of the mind itself. He believed that it was for the man of letters to record these epiphanies with extreme care, seeing that they themselves are the most delicate and evanescent of moments.”

As it is the duty of men of letters to record epiphanies, so it is the duty of historians to reveal the manifestation of God and translate it into the text. In this sense, the discourse of history signifies the human work for interpreting the wisdom of God and representing it as human knowledge.

In “Proteus,” Stephen mockingly fancies himself as a recorder of spiritual manifestations: “Remember your epiphanies written on green oval leaves, deeply deep, copies to be sent if you died to all the great libraries of the world, including Alexandria?” (U 3. 141-43) Spiritual manifestation is in part equivalent to the manifestation of God, which implies a message delivered by the guiding spirit. Stephen imagines himself a scribe of the manifestation of God by writing down epiphanies. He thinks that human duty is to fulfill the task of historical representation of the world under the Providence of God. Even so, Stephen isn’t inclined to admit the truth, because he is destined to rebel against the truth. Nobody can stop history moving toward the goal of God. Neither can Stephen stop it: “From before the ages He willed me and now may not will me away or ever. A lex eterna stays about Him.” (U 3. 47-49)

Stephen’s eternal quest for his identity continues to “Circe”:

What went forth to the ends of the world to traverse not itself, God, the sun, Shakespeare, a commercial traveler, having itself traversed in reality itself becomes that self. Wait a moment. Wait a second. Damn that fellow’s noise in the street. Self which it itself was ineluctably preconditioned to become. Eccol (U 15. 2117-21)

His understanding of history is concerned with the question about his self-exploration: “Sounds solid: made by the mallet of Los demiurgos. Am I walking into eternity along Sandymount strand?” (U 3. 17-19) Demiurge, the Creator, derives from the philosophy of Plato in Greece, and was
worshipped as the God who created the material world. In Gnosticism, Demiurge meant a heavenly being subordinate to the Supreme Being.

History is fundamentally concerned with the events that happened in reality. But isn’t it possible that the hypothesis of history deals with the events that didn’t happen or would have happened? Stephen contemplates over the possibilities of history: “It must be a movement then, an actuality of the possible as possible.” (U 2. 67) “But can those have been possible seeing that they never were? Or was that only possible which came to pass? Weave, weaver of the wind.” (U 2. 51-53)

The duty of historian is not only to expound the past events but also to predict the future to build the ideal society. Such a historian could be compared to the “weaver of the wind,” and his vocation could be to interpret and represent “this actual future preteriting unstant” (FW 143. 7-8), because “there is a future in every past that is present.” (FW 496. 35-36)

Hegel compared the providential history to the “soul-conductor” Hermes: “like the soul-conductor Mercury, the Idea is in truth, the leader of peoples and of the World; and Spirit, the rational and necessitated will of that conductor, is and has been the director of the events of the World’s History.” (9) It is interesting that Hermeticism influenced the playwrights in the Elizabethan age, because the beginning of the New Historicism is marked with a study of the English Renaissance. The original meaning of “occult” is “something hidden or concealed.” Scientists and philosophers in the Renaissance devoted themselves to the discovery of occult, of which alchemy was typical. Occultism in the Renaissance was influenced by the cyclical view of Hermes Trismegistus. The cyclical idea of history, for example, Vico’s theory of history, originated in Hermeticism. The aim of self-fashioning in the Renaissance lay in the discovery or the explication of occultism.

Conclusion

Greenblatt’s Renaissance Self-Fashioning treats More, Shakespeare, and Marlowe in the English Renaissance. The aim of the New Historicism consists in the active interpretation of the strained relations between men of letters and history. Stephen Dedalus portrayed in “Telemachia,” who is agonized by the conflict of the self and absolute reality, or the confrontation between falsehood and truth, or the struggle between vanity vs. actuality, is associated with the man of a Renaissance disposition.

Greenblatt shows us one of the definitions of self-fashioning: “Self-fashioning is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile. This threatening Other — heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, Antichrist— must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed.” (99) Coincidentally, this is very similar to the theme of “Telemachia,” that is, the discovery of the way to self-realization through the struggle with the opposite notions or concepts. Among the connotative senses of self-fashioning are self-fulfillment, self-affirmation, and self-cultivation. Thus, we
could attribute the ultimate meaning of self-fashioning to the process of growing up to discover oneself.

The process of Stephen’s self-fashioning is parallel to the journey to self-discovery. During the course of the journey, Stephen, of course, meets with failure and disappointment as well as success. Though the theme of “Telemachia” contains the ritual of spiritual initiation of quest for patriarchal order, Stephen’s quest for fatherhood requires the severe, uncompromising struggle with the inner self to confront himself face to face. Stephen could be regarded as a kind of “Renaissance man” in its modern sense of the word. He seeks truth through the encounter of the values opposite to truth: heresy, treachery, dislike, rebellion, oppression, and so on.

Stephen is destined not to escape from the journey of self-discovery or self-exploration and to try to confirm his raison d’etre. The significant journey of this kind can be planned after the experience of the communication with the outer world, which embodies oppression, heterogeneity, and displeasure. Stephen takes an important step toward the self-fashioning in the true sense of the word. To conclude, the drama of self-fashioning developed in “Telemachia” displays the struggle of the young Stephen who starts the lone journey of clarifying the meaning of history and discovering himself through Mulligan and Deasy, who personify offense, hatred, heterodoxy, and betrayal.
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